

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9021. A bill to provide that withdrawals and reservations of public lands for non-defense uses shall take effect only upon certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9022. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 9023. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9024. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9026. A bill to amend the act to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MEYER:

H.R. 9027. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of January 5, 1905, incorporating the American National Red Cross, so as to include among the purposes of such corporation the establishment of a just and lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9028. A bill to provide that certain funds shall be paid to the Kickapoo Tribal Council of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 9029. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9030. A bill to officially designate the dam now under construction at Glen Canyon on the Colorado River in northern Arizona as Powell Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9031. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, estab-

lish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 9032. A bill to authorize the appropriation to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission of an amount equal to amounts, not in excess of \$7,500,000, which may be received by the Secretary of the Navy from the sale of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register, to be expended for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 9033. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 9034. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9035. A bill to permit the issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9036. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize the construction or alteration of certain buildings in foreign countries for use by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 9037. A bill to authorize the sale at market prices or at 1959 support prices, whichever are lower, of agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide feed for livestock in areas determined to be emergency areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 9038. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the establishment of country-by-country quotas for the importation of shrimps and shrimp products, to impose a duty on all unprocessed shrimp imported in excess of the applicable quota, and to impose a duty on processed shrimp and prohibit its importation in excess of the applicable quota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.J. Res. 516. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our

country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Con. Res. 430. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to sponsor and support resolutions curtailing restraints on world trade resulting from cartels and other forms of world monopoly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 9039. A bill for the relief of George Gozadinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 9040. A bill for the relief of Ana Fernandez Lambea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H.R. 9041. A bill for the relief of Joseph Starker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 9042. A bill for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 9043. A bill for the relief of Mock Fook Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

270. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the assistant city clerk, Stockton, Calif., requesting that the Congress override the Presidential veto of H.R. 7509, public works appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

271. Also, petition of the city clerk, Boston, Mass., requesting favorable action on H.R. 4633, relating to home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

272. Also, petition of Rosemary Macklem and others, Cleveland, Ohio, requesting that the American Indians get justice in the way of better living such as, better housing, food, water, medicine, and education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Stuart Symington Cited by AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, at its recent national convention in Grand Rapids, AMVETS presented our distinguished colleague from Missouri, Senator Sym-

INGTON, with its first defense award in "recognition of exceptional contributions to the defense of the United States and the free world." I can think of no one more deserving of this recognition than Senator SYMINGTON. In its citation, AMVETS points out that Senator SYMINGTON "has brought to the Senate unique understanding of the times in which we live." I concur wholeheartedly with this statement and with the other commendations in the citation.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, together with an excellent address which Senator SYMINGTON delivered before the AMVETS convention.

There being no objection, the citation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS NATIONAL CITATION

The 14th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in St. Louis, Mo., on August 22, 1958, unanimously resolved that its first defense award be presented to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator, in recognition of exceptional contributions to the defense of the United States and the free world.

Throughout his outstanding career, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON has contributed exceptionally to the national strength of the United States. He has consistently emphasized to the Government and the public the necessity for impenetrable national defense, as a threat against aggression and to successfully counteract aggression should it occur. Senator SYMINGTON continues to protect the United States and the free world through his active participation on the important Senate Armed Services Committee and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

Senator SYMINGTON, who in 1958 was elected to the U.S. Senate by the highest percentage of votes cast in the history of Missouri, has brought to the Senate unique understanding of the times in which we live. His is the voice of a dedicated American with exceptional knowledge of current military needs. His is the voice of authority on national defense. His is the voice of authority on airpower. His is the voice of authority on defense reorganization.

Senator SYMINGTON's brilliant service as the Nation's first Secretary of the Air Force was responsible for many of the initial and subsequent contributions which the Air Force has made to the defensive strength of the United States and the free world. Earlier, the devoted public servant enhanced national welfare as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, and Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

AMVETS and the United States—and the free world which looks to America to help preserve its freedom—are deeply indebted to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON. It is with the greatest pride and appreciation that AMVETS present to him their first national defense award.

Presented August 27, 1959, AMVETS 15th Annual National Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich.

W. E. BURDINE, M.D.,
National Commander.
P. E. HOWARD,
National Executive Director.

THE PROTRACTED PSYCHOLOGICAL CONFLICT
(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON before the AMVETS National Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich., August 27, 1949)

It is a great privilege to be with you here in Grand Rapids at this national convention of the AMVETS.

Your organization is unsurpassed in its efforts towards adequate national defense.

Those in Government charged with responsibility in this field depend upon groups such as yours to keep our citizens both informed and alert about whether or not the strength of this Nation is adequate enough to insure our remaining a free people.

National defense is not just physical defense. It involves far more. It is the whole of our effort to keep the peace. It includes economic growth, scientific progress, the state of our morale and the quality of our education.

AMVETS does a magnificent job for its veteran members. But when it branches out—exploring the meaning of Americanism; granting scholarships; helping make better communities; speaking out for the legislation in which it believes—then your great organization makes its complete contribution to our overall security.

In the 15 years since its founding, AMVETS has grown steadily in stature.

And now you stand a vigorous, far-reaching, forward-looking organization, dedicated always to the welfare of our country.

In these 15 years this Nation has matured and expanded under the continuing challenge of world communism. We have disarmed, and armed again; forged great alliances; begun to build up underdeveloped areas; and learned some of the patience

which must go with leadership of the free world.

Now we enter a new phase. In less than 3 weeks, Premier Khrushchev will come to this country.

It is hoped that he will leave these shores without incident—and with a better understanding of our basic strengths.

But it would be a tragic error to believe that his visit connotes any shift in Communist goals or strategy.

The Sino-Soviet Empire is committed to a single objective. They seek it at times by talk of peace, at times by war; in one place through professed efforts towards peace; in another by subversion.

But the basic goal is always the same: namely, the overthrow of parliamentary government, all over the world—resulting in their rule of all people.

We seem now to be headed for a phase which will be marked by increasing contact between communism and free peoples.

This means an increasing competition of words, ideas, and performance; and it is about this—what I would call the psychological side of the conflict—that I would speak briefly today.

The Russians are ready.

In his speech to the Second Congress of the Communist International, back in 1920, Lenin said: "Great are the military victories of the Soviet Republic, but still more significant is the victory over the minds and hearts of the masses, the victory of Communist ideas all over the world."

Following Lenin's advice, the Communists have developed the most effective machinery and the most refined strategy of propaganda the world has ever known.

Their assault on the mind takes many forms. It may be a peace congress in Sweden, a youth festival in Vienna, a strike in Paris, or a fair in New York.

Wherever it is, and whatever it is, you can be sure it is a well-planned monolithic effort, with the inspiration coming primarily from two places—Moscow and Peking.

In this area of protracted psychological conflict the Communists are believed to be spending between \$2 and \$3 billion a year. It is an effort which has but one purpose—to drum home the Communist line, so as to soften up any opposition, as they move on with their plans for conquest.

But deeds are stronger than words; and the most ingenious propaganda is weakened if belied by actions.

This is what happened recently in Hungary, and even more recently in Tibet.

And that is why, despite the scope of the Communist effort, it is they, not us, who are vulnerable in this propaganda field at this time—if only we will shed the current complacency and go to work.

Greater effort in the psychological field could draw rich dividends for the cause of freedom.

Behind the Iron Curtain—in the so-called zone of peace in which we now let Communist rule go unchallenged—the people are nevertheless stirring.

Ideas of freedom have seeped through the blockade of indoctrination and thought control.

Why else would 250,000 Poles turn out to cheer the Vice President of the chief capitalist nation of the world?

Why else would 1 out of every 10 East Germans have left their country since 1950, drawn by the symbol of freedom which is West Berlin?

Yes; dissent and doubt are on the rise in many places behind the curtain.

Let me tell you a story, the authenticity of which is vouched for by the distinguished free Austrian magazine, *Forum*.

At the time of the Hungarian revolution 140 students were expelled from a Moscow university.

Their crime? In the middle of a class on Marxism they began to ask why, in Hungary,

workers and peasants had risen against the Communist state.

The Russian students were not satisfied with the answer of their teachers, so they went to the rooms of Hungarian students and literally dragged them out of bed to ask some searching questions.

They wanted to know whether the Communist Party has not in fact become the exploiting class Marx warned against; and, if this were true, whether Marxist theory would not demand that the people revolt against the party.

These discussions spread to other Russian universities, where the question was even asked whether "the Russian workers, under Lenin's banner, will not rise against their bureaucratized exploiters."

Only extreme subsequent disciplinary measures quieted this outbreak of criticism. But the incident shows that, after 40 years of control, the Communists would seem to have failed in the indoctrination of some of their youth.

With wise and careful effort, we can carry on this battle of ideas behind the lines to great advantage.

We should utilize holes that have been opened up in the Iron Curtain to intensify our efforts to win converts to freedom's cause.

The crucial weapons of such an effort, I am glad to say, cost nothing.

They need no lead time, because we have them.

They are not subject to mechanical failures.

And they have not grown obsolete in 183 years.

They are parts of our life which many of us take for granted. But translated into the lives led by the people behind the Iron Curtain, they become concepts of great motive power.

First of course is the idea of freedom. The Iron Curtain people should know that if they lived under our system, they would be able to walk the streets without identity cards. They could move to a new city without registering with the police. They would be able to apply for the kind of job they wished, instead of being assigned by the state. They could read, think and speak what they pleased.

And then there is self-determination—people being free to choose their own form of government, without pressure from foreign troops on their soil; living in a land where men can choose their own government representatives in free elections.

Also there is the concept of material well-being—better pay, better working conditions, a better standard of living.

How interested these men and women would be to study the way we in America have narrowed the historic gap between rich and poor without revolution or bloodshed.

Why should we fear increasing contact between the Communists and ourselves? Their way of life has no attraction for us. But our way of life has much attraction for them.

The more they learn about how we live, the more they will realize that the free world has actually delivered the better life which the Communists promise.

Why is it that the truth about the West is so largely unknown behind the Iron Curtain?

A few comparisons can answer much of that story.

In the last year, while the Russians were spending billions in psychological warfare, our total effort in this field amounted to less than \$150 million.

That is about 3 hours' output of 1 day of our annual income.

We have the weapons to lead the world to peace. But we neglect the means of delivery.

Therefore, I recommend a four-point program to help our country mount a new major offensive in this battle for men's minds.

First, there should be intensification of our radio broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain, our presentation of the truth about America.

We should be able to broadcast long enough, loud enough, and on enough channels to break through Communist jamming efforts.

We should not raise false hopes in the hearts of people—but we should keep constantly before them the difference between their life now, and the life they could have under freedom.

Second, we should increase personal contacts between Communist and free world peoples—through travel, letters, and exchange programs.

The young Americans serving as guides at the Moscow Fair have reported that their own personal views and experiences about life in the United States are a most effective counter to Communist propaganda.

Third, there should be better preparation of our Foreign Service people for jobs abroad. We cannot get over our message to another land or person if our representatives do not know the language. They cannot be effective unless they understand the culture and customs of the country in question.

Far too many of our representatives abroad are not properly equipped for their job. It was for this reason that I proposed the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy, to train the free world advocates of a lasting peace so they could present their message with maximum effect.

Finally, there should be a much more effective use of religion as an antidote to communism.

Eighty percent of the people held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain are Christians.

A large percentage of them are devout; and therefore, when their beliefs rub against the atheistic policies of their Communist rulers friction is automatic.

We have not yet made full use of our creeds and religious convictions as a weapon in this cold war. Through broadcasts, we could do much more in emphasizing the strength of our faith.

These broadcasts should stress the dignity of man under God, along with other religious ideals incompatible with Communist doctrine.

Why not, for example, translate and dramatize some of the outstanding religious broadcasts we hear on our own networks every Sunday.

I present these opportunities and suggest how we might use them. At this point, however, let me make it clear that I do not suggest stirring up any revolution.

But we do want to spread the truth, for there is a good chance that this truth will spread dissatisfaction, and thereby force some relaxation of Russian rule, in terms of more understanding and therefore more good will.

The head of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Allen Dulles, asserted in a recent speech that while the Soviet Government is still a closely regulated autocracy, it is not today quite as free as under Stalin to disregard wholly the desire of the people.

This applies at least as much to the Soviet satellites. They would be grateful for the slightest ration of the fruit of freedom.

If we can help them to that end, all our effort will have been worthwhile—and the goal of peace will be much nearer to mankind.

First Hungary, and then Tibet, have shown the Communists that if control of their satellites is based on force alone, they damage their cause in the uncommitted nations.

And by spreading our ideas, and ideals, we can stimulate apprehension in the countries

they still do not control; plus unrest in the countries they do.

Such possible progress through truth can only reduce the Communist threat to our own security.

As our country heads into the uncertain future, testing new methods of diplomacy, facing new techniques, I have faith that this great organization of AMVETS will support these efforts, efforts essential for our security, our prosperity, and the greatest of all blessings, a just and lasting peace.

Communist Propaganda in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement:

The Speaker has generously granted permission to me to exhibit in the Speaker's lobby of the House of Representatives several samples of Communist propaganda typical of that now being disseminated in the Middle East and in south and southeast Asia. This exhibit is designed to acquaint Members of Congress with the scope, breadth, variety, skill, and effectiveness of Communist propaganda in this area of the world and with the corresponding challenge it presents for American policy.

Among the aspects of this challenge, highlighted in the exhibit, are the following points:

First. Propaganda from the Soviet Union and Communist China is supplementary in various fields and in different countries. Chinese propaganda, for instance, appears more often in Pakistan, which is at odds with the Soviet Union, while the Soviets are more active in Burma, where the Chinese are regarded as a direct threat. A major role is also given to propaganda from countries of central and eastern Europe, particularly in the sphere of cultural and economic affairs.

Second. Soviet and Chinese publications are attractive, and present life under communism in terms designed to appeal to the workers and peasants of most of non-Communist Asia. China alone sold an estimated \$1 million worth of propaganda material at cut-rate prices out of Hong Kong last year.

Samples of direct propaganda publications include:

From China: China Pictorial, China Reconstructs, Women of China, People's China.

From U.S.S.R.: The Soviets distribute New Times, Soviet Literature, Soviet Union, Soviet Land, Soviet Weekly, Soviet Woman, Culture, and Life.

From central and east Europe: Romtrans—Romanian Industry—Czechoslovak Life, Bulgarian Foreign Trade, GDR Review (East German), Do You Know the Rumanian Peoples' Republic?

In the middle east Communist French publications such as *Democratie Nouvelle* are available.

Asian Communist countries, such as North Korea and North Vietnam distribute their own magazines.

Third. The official Communist propaganda pamphlet campaign is accompanied by standard literature. Russian classics are constantly being reprinted in English. Indeed, more publications in English are now being printed behind the Iron Curtain for distribution in non-Communist Asian countries than are being printed for such purposes by the United States and Great Britain combined.

Each year, scores of new titles in Hindi, Bengali, and Urdu and other national languages are also released. "Handbooks on Marx," "People's China, U.S.S.R.," "Chinese Cooking and Chinese Papercuts," are on sale everywhere, as is the Constitution of the Soviet Union in nearly all languages. Important pronouncements and interviews with Soviet leaders are widely distributed.

Books and albums are published in China and Moscow on the visits of Soviet leaders to other Asian countries. Publications on Islam and Buddhism are frequently distributed.

Communist propaganda aims at filling gaps in available literature wherever such gaps exist. Thus there is much concentration on children's books such as "The Silver Hoof," "Frisky Kitten," "Ukrainian Folk Tales," and a series of "Peace Fables"—published in Bucharest.

Indian art publications are published in Moscow and distributed in India. Many art postcards sold in India are printed in Moscow.

This Communist propaganda effort through books and periodicals is, of course, only one arm of a sustained, long-term program. That program also includes the persistent use of radio, press, films, trade fairs and cultural missions. The following brief summary indicates the extent of some of these supplementary activities:

Radio: Communist Chinese broadcasts number 242 hours per week in 10 Asiatic languages and 5 Chinese dialects. Chinese abroad numbering 30 million are considered as an important target and instrument for Communist propaganda. Moscow broadcasts much more extensively—8 hours weekly to southern Vietnam for instance, 35 hours weekly to Persia, and an unspecified number in Hindi, Bengal, Urdu, Tamil, Telugu, Singhalese, and other Asian languages.

Press: The actual Communist press in Asia is not very extensive—six papers in India, two in Pakistan, four in Ceylon and five in Japan. But Soviet and Chinese propaganda is carried on (a) through local press agencies which distribute news issued by Tass and the New China Agency, and (b) via extensive distributions of Chinese and Soviet publications in French, English and all Asiatic languages.

Films: Great emphasis is placed on presenting Communist films in Asia. Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary make particular efforts in this field. In addition, Polish-Indian, Hungaro-Indian, Soviet-Indian film companies have been created and are discussing joint

productions. The Soviet Union produced the national film "In Pakistan" and the so-called Indian monumental "Pardesi."

Trade fairs, cultural, scientific, and sport exchange missions between Asian countries and the Communist bloc have been considerably increased. The Soviet Union and China have their pavilions at all trade fairs such as the Indian Fairs at Hyderabad or Bombay, or in Pakistan's Lahore Fair. So have east European countries. Presently in Cairo and Bombay there are Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Polish and East German industrial shows. Czechoslovak string quartets and Rumanian dance teams, East German sport teams and Chinese wrestlers visit the majority of Middle East and Asian countries. Communist teams are present at all Asian festivals. Chinese Buddhist art exhibitions tour Ceylon, India, and Burma.

The single, overall conclusion of any current survey of Communist propaganda in Asia is its formidable continuity of purpose. It is a long-term effort, being conducted with purpose and skill. It is not calculated to achieve dramatic or immediate success, but rather long-term impact in depth.

The importance of Asia to Communist strategy is obvious. America's stake in the future of free Asia is equally clear. We will need new thinking and new responses if this challenge is to be met effectively in the months and years ahead.

I hope that this exhibit in the speaker's lobby will help broaden understanding of the nature of this challenge. In the preparation of this material for exhibit, the International Federation of Free Journalists was most helpful, and I gratefully acknowledge their cooperation. I hope that as many Members of Congress as possible will see this exhibit during the next few days.

Passage of Des Plaines Wildlife Area Legislation Vital to Illinois Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an item of legislation, H.R. 3894, which may die in committee in these last few days of the session and upon which action should be taken without further delay.

This bill directs the Army and the General Services Administration to transfer to the State of Illinois approximately 2,400 acres attached to the Joliet Arsenal grounds as wildlife hunting, game preserve, and recreational area adjoining the Des Plaines and Kankakee Rivers. This 2,400 acres should provide not only a wildlife and game preserve but also a fine recreation ground.

CV—1123

The Army, however does not wish to give up any rights to the 1,500 acres south of the present preserve and wants to substitute another area of the present preserve. This substitute area has been carefully inspected and pronounced to be totally unsatisfactory. The Army argues that it needs the other area for military maneuvering purposes. Even without the 4,000 acres in question, the Army would have 39,000 acres for maneuvers. It would seem to me that the Army could do some pretty extensive maneuvering in 39,000 acres.

It would be a shame for Congress to adjourn without concurring with the Senate action on this bill which is not only in the interest of the citizens of Illinois but concerns everyone interested in the preservation of our Nation's public recreational areas.

The Right to Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before Senator ERNEST GRUENING's Subcommittee on Passport Legislation on September 1:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON, BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PASSPORT LEGISLATION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1959

It is my opinion that the Secretary of State does not have and should not be given powers to prevent an American citizen, Member of Congress or not, from visiting any country in the world. Unless we are actually at war, American citizens should be freely allowed U.S. permission to visit all countries. A passport should be only an identification. Its issuance should be an almost entirely clerical act, not a question of executive discretion to be decided in terms of foreign policy considerations.

Some of the legislation under consideration by this committee was requested of the Congress by the President of the United States July 7, 1958, to authorize the Secretary of State to refuse passports for travel in designated countries or areas. From the Executive's point of view there may seem to be advantages to this but, in my opinion and as in the case of many other restrictions on freedom, the disadvantages are far greater.

Four alleged advantages are set forth in a letter dated July 2, 1959, which I received from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr.

The first advantage listed had to do with the emergency declared in 1950 and which is still in effect. This means there is a state of unresolved conflict between Communist China and the United States. I fall to see how restricting travel by U.S. citizens assists us in resolving this cold-war type of conflict in our favor. On the other hand I can conceive of improved relations resulting from such visits. However, the Department of State itself has granted permission to 41 U.S. journalists to travel in China. This seems to recognize the fact that the cold war is best fought through an increase of infor-

mation and understanding. Our motives are good. We plan no aggressions. We truly want peace, freedom, and improved living conditions for the people of the world. To ban travel is to cut off effective personal communication. This lessens the opportunities for the understanding which must be the basis for any real peace.

Second, it is alleged that the United States can't provide the customary protection in these areas, the governments of which we don't recognize. There are many risks a U.S. citizen still takes without the aid of the protective arm of his Government. A citizen going to the Dominican Republic takes the usual risks in a police state of becoming a casualty, something which our diplomatic representatives there can neither prevent nor mend nor readily punish. All that the State Department should do in such circumstances is make certain that the citizen contemplating a trip to a police state understands the risks he faces.

Third, in the case of China, such restrictions are supposed to punish, or at least indicate our disapproval of, the Chinese Communist Government for mistreating and holding as hostages our citizens. This is on the erroneous assumption that our refusing permission to our citizens to visit China hurts or at least demeans them more than it handicaps us in seeking both peace and facts. I feel that we would secure the release of the five remaining U.S. prisoners far sooner if we permitted wider interpersonal communications between our country and Communist China.

Fourth, the State Department refers to what it terms an "important factor," the effort of the Communist Chinese to utilize trade and cultural contacts to promote political objectives hostile to our interests. We can hardly hope to win the cold war if we refuse to join battle on the trade, cultural and other fronts. Indeed, with respect to the Soviet Union, by far our major opponent, we carry on, amid almost universal applause, an extensive program of visitor exchanges. The President's recent decision to trade visits with Khrushchev is a dramatic affirmation of the President's belief that such contacts can aid the cause of peace.

We cannot rely on increased communication alone to guarantee peace. It is even more clear that the willful ignorance or any variety of iron curtains makes war more probable.

Every American citizen who travels abroad is an ambassador. Most are good ones. Some are not. All learn things which they bring back to be evaluated. Enemy stereotypes are blurred by facts and obliterated by understanding.

The peoples of the world don't want war. If informed, they can be powerful drags on imperialistic ambitions of their rulers. Ordinary person-to-person contacts are the best way for human beings to form tolerant and friendly opinions of each other. Curtains between countries, whether of iron, bamboo, visas or passports, become black shrouds for the cause of world peace.

These are some of the reasons why American citizens should be permitted by their Government to travel anywhere. I also believe that this is part of the freedoms guaranteed to every American citizen. This question is for the judiciary to settle.

On August 27, 1959, I filed suit against the Secretary of State because he had refused to give me permission to travel in China. With the chairman's permission I shall file the text of this complaint at the conclusion of these remarks. A Member of Congress is in a somewhat different position from one who is not a Member. Secretary Macomber, in the letter cited above, wrote to me, "as a Member of Congress your visit would be interpreted throughout Asia as well as by the

Communist Chinese as a basic change in policy at the very time when the Communists are engaged in liquidating the Tibetan revolt, threatening war in the Taiwan Straits, and showing increasing arrogance and contempt for international law and decency."

I see no necessity for an interpretation that the suggested change of policy would mean any softening of our attitude. Certainly no softening is justifiable. Red Chinese aggression in Tibet, Laos, and India should be dealt with firmly. No one is suggesting that we forgive or forget Korea.

My visit to China, or the visits of other Members, should be characterized to the world as fact-finding missions with no such overtones, just as the Eisenhower visit to the Soviet Union cannot be accurately interpreted as meaning that we have forgotten or forgiven the slaughter in Hungary.

It seems to me there is a more pertinent difference in the case of the Member of Congress who seeks permission to go to China or any other country. This has to do with our keystone governmental doctrine, the separation of powers. The executive cannot, it seems to me, forbid a member of the legislative branch to visit any country with which we are not actually engaged in war. My lawsuit against the Secretary of State seeks a judicial decision on this question.

Moreover, since the State Department has seen fit to give permission to travel in Communist China to 41 journalists, its refusal to permit a Member of Congress seems arbitrary and discriminatory.

Let me make it clear that I do not believe that my going to China is in itself of much importance. This is a test case and I am seeking to help open the way for a policy change which will permit others, far better qualified than I, to go. The harm done by the present policy is more apparent when we consider that the State Department's position also blocks travel by Senator MAGNUSON, the chairman of the Senate's Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator COOPER, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator ENGLE, and other Members in both branches. Every Member of Congress has a duty to inform himself on legislative matters and to work for national security, but of course the special constitutional role of the Senate with respect to foreign policy makes the State Department's obstructionism with respect to Senators all the more intolerable and unconstitutional.

My plans for a trip to China and the Far East always have included being accompanied by other Members of Congress, experts in the area and in trade matters, businessmen, and journalists. That I am the sole plaintiff against the Secretary of State does not mean I intended to go to China as a lone, self-appointed investigating committee. Specifically I want to learn what I can, firsthand, about the conditions and potentialities of trade, especially with Oregon.

Warsaw in Chains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to many recent favorable reviews, here and in England, of a book recently published by Stefan Korbonski, entitled "Warsaw in Chains."

There has been of late much interest in recent political developments in Po-

land. Many Americans are having considerable difficulty in fairly assessing that situation. Vice President Nixon's recent visit to Poland and the unusually warm welcome given to him by the people of that Communist-controlled nation, serve to stress again the warm feeling of friendship to the United States by the Polish people.

The author, Stefan Korbonski, a lawyer by profession, was the political head of the huge Polish underground that fought gallantly under the exiled Polish leadership in London throughout the Nazi occupation. His experiences of personal arrests and escapes make fantastic reading.

I most warmly recommend "Warsaw in Chains" to those of my colleagues who would like to understand better the present situation in Poland and the developments of the last 20 years. It makes excellent and most educational reading.

Golden Dollars—Poets and Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, proof is readily available, and I shall supply it here, that Capitol Hill is inhabited not only by statesmen but also by poets, or, at least, versifiers.

Only recently the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and I sent to each Member of Congress a "golden dollar" supplied by the Fairbanks, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce and good for \$1 in trade—in Fairbanks. These were "minted," or so our covering letter stated, in commemoration of Alaska's admission to the Union. Accompanying the letter sent to each Member of Congress was a rhymed presentation, a wonderful work of art, no less, from the mind and pen of Charlie Hughes, administrative assistant to Representative RIVERS. So that the whole wide world, or, at least, that part of it which turns to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for education and enjoyment, may have the benefit of reading Charlie Hughes' verses, I present them now:

Today we all holler for a good sound dollar,
A low-priced car and a no-wilt collar;
But, despite the advance of this thing "auto-
mation,"
We can't even return nickel beers to the
Nation.

But up in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska
(A wonderful place, if people should ask ya),
The chamber of commerce has done some-
thing about
A fair return for what you put out.

In honor of Alaska's becoming a State,
And joining you all in the "south 48,"
They've minted a dollar that's worth a whole
buck

In all sorts of merchandize, including
"mukluk."

They've sent us a "golden dollar" for you,
In honor of statehood—a dream come true;
It comes to you with the chamber's good
cheer;

But spend it in Fairbanks—it's no good here.

Mr. President, another "Charlie" has retaliated in rhyme. He is none other than my friend CHARLIE BOYLE, that is to say the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, Member of the House of Representatives for the 12th District of Illinois. CHARLIE BOYLE responded to the gift of the "golden dollar" in these words:

Your "golden dollar" has been received
What will be done with it can't be perceived
Spending in Fairbanks will have to wait
For it looks like we're stuck in the "south
48."

With adjournment appearing not coming
forth

We won't get a chance to journey north
But thanks anyway for your little token
Perhaps we can use it for the highway
program.

Mr. President, the situation is getting out of hand. Poetry begets poetry. Before we are done with this we shall doubtless have a sufficient supply of the muse on hand for the publication of a book, or books. Even as I set about to leave my office to go to the floor to make sure that these enduring words were preserved in print for posterity, another stanza reached me, responsive to the "golden dollar" theme. This is from Congressman HOWARD W. ROBINSON of the 37th District of New York:

Thanks for the dollar—it's welcome you bet;
But my only problem is how to get
From here to Alaska—so please send the
fare,
And I'll spring for the beers, when I get
there!

The Aptuxcet Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a unique observance is taking place on September 5 and 6 in the town of Bourne, Mass., where I have my summer home and which is represented in the House by our colleague, Hon. HASTINGS KEITH.

The townspeople on these days will commemorate the establishment, in the year 1627, of the Aptuxcet Trading Post in the town of Bourne, on the banks of the Manamet River. It was here that the colonists of the Plimoth Plantation wrote and signed the first business contract in America, thus becoming the birthplace of American capitalism and free enterprise.

A replica of the trading post stands on the original foundations of the post. In 1627, an agreement was written setting up the trading post, by the colonists of the Plimoth Plantation. The written instrument gave certain of their number control of the trade, the purpose of which was to pay off the huge debt still owed to the London promoters of the

Mayflower expedition, to transport more of their countrymen to Plimoth.

The observance on September 5 and 6 will be marked by a pageant at the post, depicting the historical events connected with it.

The significance of the event is that it was here that the system of free enterprise contracts had their beginning. The colonists built on a firm foundation. From this humble start the way of life established by these rugged settlers became the vehicle for the development of the economic strength which has made our country the greatest power in world history.

Remarks on Diversion of Water Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks on the diversion of water issue.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY BEFORE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON DIVERSION OF WATER ISSUE

Let us first get a little of the history involved in this water diversion. Since 1922, bills have been introduced in Congress to authorize the diversion. They were introduced mostly by Congressmen from the city of Chicago. The bills based their right for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan on the following grounds:

- (1) Sanitation—for sewage disposal purposes.
- (2) Public health—caused by contamination of waters of the Chicago River, the Chicago Sanitary District Canal, and the Illinois Waterway.
- (3) Diversion would permit the generation of additional waterpower at the Chicago District Lockport plant.
- (4) Fish life would be restored.
- (5) It would eliminate damage by extremely high waters of Lake Michigan.
- (6) Navigation requirements of the Illinois Waterway demanded additional diversion.
- (7) Then there was the position that diversion should be authorized to take care of a variety of demands in the Mississippi River watershed.

Harry Truman once quoted Justice Holmes as follows: "A page of history is worth a volume of logic," so let us get at some of the historical facts.

The controversy originated between the years 1892 and 1900 when the Chicago metropolitan area cut a canal across the Continental Divide. Previously the Illinois-Michigan Canal was completed in 1848. This canal soon became polluted with sewage; and, finally, in 1887, the Commission studied three methods of sewage disposal and recommended as the most economical the discharge of the sewage into the Des Plaines River through a canal across the Continental Divide. The legislature took action and the sanitary district was created with power to handle the situation. At that time, the sanitary district embraced an area of 185 square miles—it now embraces 600 square miles.

Since the opening of the canal, the Chicago River has been reversed. Then, it flowed into Lake Michigan—now it flows away from Lake Michigan. The purpose of the canal was the disposal of sewage and the production of electricity, so the Court found.

In 1907, an application was made to do certain work on the Calumet-Sag Channel to increase the flow from Lake Michigan through said channel. But this was refused by the Secretary of War. In spite of this, the sanitary district went right ahead; so the United States brought suit in 1908. Then, another application of the district in 1913 was denied by the Secretary of War.

In 1908, pursuant to the amendment of the constitution of Illinois, development was begun of a project that would construct powerplants, locks, bridges, and dams, starting at the water powerplant near Lockport to a point on the Illinois River near Utica; the justification therefore was that it would provide about \$3 million a year from the use of water diverted from Lake Michigan for waterpower purposes.

Well, the diversion was made without the consent of the States bordering on the Great Lakes, and in defiance of the Federal Government. Temporary permits were granted from time to time by reluctant Secretaries of War on the plea that the district and Illinois had neglected or refused to install modern sewage disposal plants and that the health of the people would be impaired.

The sewage pollution continued to be offensive up through the years. In 1925, the U.S. position for injunctive relief was affirmed by the Supreme Court, although the Secretary granted a permit for diversion of 8,500 cubic feet—looking to a progressive reduction. Meanwhile, in 1920, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the United States, made a report stating, in substance, that Chicago was debarred from any claim for indulgence; that it had defiantly opposed the Government and was in open disregard of the law; and that they had expended money of their constituents in prosecution of unwise and illegal plans.

In 1927, the Court, having referred the action of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan to Special Master Charles Evans Hughes, who said that the district, in relying on the arguments with reference to the health of its people, had long delayed the subject of suitable sewage plants as a means of avoiding future diversion. Therefore, the district could not complain if an immediately heavy burden was placed upon the district because of its attitude and its course of action. The Court further required that the rights of the complainants be restored gradually; giving the district time to provide adequate means for disposing of the sewage. In other words, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Chicago Sanitary District, and the State of Illinois, must stop the illegal diversion (281 U.S. 179) and the Court observed that "the diversion of water for sewage disposal was held illegal."

In 1932, on the application of the States, including Ohio, the Court appointed a Special Master, Edward F. McClellan. He found that the causes of delay in obtaining approval of the construction of controlling works in the Chicago River "are total and inexcusable failures of the defendants to make an application to the Secretary of War for such approval." The Court entered its decree and provided for "gradual reduction of the diversion of waters of the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence system through the Chicago drainage canal; the reduction should be down to 1,500 cubic feet per second by December 31, 1938."

Again, the district delayed and, in 1932, application was made by the complainants again for a special officer to see that the decree of April 21, 1930 (281 U.S. 696) was carried out.

In 1933, the Court enlarged its decree to provide that "the State of Illinois is re-

quired to take the necessary steps to complete adequate sewage disposal plants and sewers to the end that the reduction of diversion may be made at the times fixed in the decree." The sanitary district then demanded that the Federal Government purchase the canals, paying \$90 million therefor. The engineer department reported against it and this started the flood of bills; beginning in 1937, in the 75th Congress, seeking authorization for increased diversion of water.

In the Supreme Court Decree of April 21, 1930, there was a requirement in paragraph 5 that the defendant's sanitary district file with the clerk of the court semiannually, on July 1 and January 1 of each year—beginning July 1, 1930—a report to the Court adequately setting forth the progress made in the construction of the sewage treatment plants and appurtenances outlined in the program. Also, it was to set forth the extent and effect of the operation thereof and the average diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

Again, the sanitary district failed to comply with this order. The last semiannual report was filed on January 2, 1939, which said that "the complete treatment of all sewage will not be possible until July 1939,"—although the district was required to complete construction of the facilities on or before December 31, 1938. In January 1940, an application was made again for more diversion. The Court said, in relation to the same, "Illinois has failed to show that it has provided all possible means at its command for the completion of the sewage treatment system as required by the decree and no adequate excuse has been presented for the delay." The Court appointed a special master again and he recommended that the petition of Illinois be dismissed. The Supreme Court upheld the master's report.

Again, in 1956, Illinois petitioned the Court for a temporary modification of the decree and the Solicitor General filed a memorandum on behalf of the Government, as amicus curiae; pointing out the interests of the United States with regard to the paramount power of Congress in relation to navigation and treaties between the United States and Canada which affect the total problem of diversion. The Court, on the application of the district, granted a petition for temporary increase of diversion to, and including, January 31, 1957, and extended it again to February 28, 1957 (352 U.S. 983).

HISTORY OF THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Since 1920, bills have been entered to increase the diversion. Twice President Eisenhower has vetoed bills; stating, in substance, that he was unable to approve the bill because:

- (1) Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River.
- (2) All methods of control of lake levels, and protection of property on the Great Lakes, should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.
- (3) Diversions should be authorized with reference to negotiations with Canada.
- (4) The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversions may be adversely affected.

In the 85th Congress, a bill providing for an additional diversion for 3 years was passed in the House, but failed in the Senate.

The Chicago district pressure has not been limited to bills in Congress. Applications were made to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, with Secretaries of War and with various boards and commissions.

Now, it is evident that Chicago has no health problem. Back in 1940 it was claimed that diversion was necessary because the pollution in the Chicago drainage canal constituted a menace to health. The special

master, after extensive hearings, held that there was no menace to health. We know very well that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet will not clean up the objectionable conditions in the Illinois Waterway as long as untreated, and partially treated, sewage and sludge is permitted to enter the waterway. The permanent solution is to keep pollution out of the Chicago area's waterways by enforcing State and district laws prohibiting the dumping of raw, or partially treated, sewage, chemicals, and other materials in the streams and waterways of the State of Illinois. Eminent sanitary engineers are agreed that the effluent (liquid residual which remains after complete treatment of the well of an operated sewage disposal plant of an activated-sludge of modern type) is a clear, odorless liquid—nonputrescible which requires no chlorination and in which fish can live. The sanitary district affirms that the effluent of its northside treating plant "is almost as clear as drinking water, and quite as harmless as it finally leaves the plant through an outlet and into and through an artificial channel which discharges into the Chicago River" (278 U.S. 367).

There is no claim that additional diversion is needed for navigation on the Illinois Waterway, or for navigation on the Mississippi River. In a recent report by the division engineer, he states that "commerce on the Illinois Waterway has increased from 1,600,000 tons, in 1935, to 21 million tons in 1955." Recent studies of present and prospective water requirement for navigation on the Illinois Waterway show that the authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan is adequate to meet those requirements.

The Alton lock, which was provided by Public Law 500, will take care of any trouble during low water.

Now, the Supreme Court has made it pretty clear that it will not permit any additional diversion at Chicago until the district utilizes all practical means, other than diversion, to alleviate conditions complained of. The U.S. Public Health Service has indicated that there are measures which the sanitary district can take which would handle the situation: Sewage treatment through aeration or chlorination, or the combination of the two. (See Senate Subcommittee on Public Works hearings, 1958, p. 92.) Based on aeration, the first cost would be \$2 million; annual cost \$250,000. Based on chlorination, the first cost is not given; annual cost \$550,000.

It is very evident that the reason the sanitary district urges additional diversion is to avoid the normal and usual sanitation costs which would be required in expanding its facilities. Away back in 1913, when application was made to Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, he stated:

"The demands for diversion at Chicago are based solely upon the needs for sanitation of that city. Every drop of water taken out of the lake necessarily tends to nullify costly improvements made under direct authority of Congress throughout the Great Lakes; and, it is manifestly said that, as long as the city is permitted to increase the amount of water which it may take from the lakes, there will be very strong temptation placed upon it not to take a more scientific—and possibly a more expensive—method to dispose of the sewage."

The Supreme Court on April 21, 1930, limited the amount of water that could be diverted from the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence system to 1,500 cubic feet in addition to domestic pumpage (281 U.S. 696).

There are the House bill, the Senate bill, and the amended bill, all considered by the committee. A study of the bills indicates quite clearly that some fertile minds which drew the two amendments were trying to meet some of the arguments that were made. The Power Authority of the State of New

York, when it accepted the licenses granted to it by the Federal Power Commission for the construction of the Niagara power projects, did so, relying on the decree mentioned above.

The Canadian Government and the State of New York will in the course of the next 3 or 4 years have completed the power projects at an expense of over half a billion dollars. By that time, the power projects will be in full operation and a diversion of 1 year will be felt, causing a loss yearly of over a million dollars in income. So there is no question that the power authority would be deprived of substantial legal rights.

As we have already stated, such a diversion in violation of the Court's decree and the legal treaties would justify the claims of Canada to divert all the water from the Columbia River.

Now the next question arises, Is there any need for a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for such a study? Senate Document No. 128 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, states: "Recent studies of present and prospective water requirements for navigation on the Illinois Waterway show that the authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan is adequate to meet those requirements" (p. 48) and shows that losses would result from increased diversion to navigation, power development, and shore property interest. Further, that if the water were diverted, such study could not possibly demonstrate that the levels of the Great Lakes and the flow at Niagara and the St. Lawrence River would not be affected detrimentally—with adverse effects on navigation and power development. It would also show, if such diversion were made, increased power production at the sanitary district's plant at Lockport, Ill., saving the district money.

The U.S. Department of Health in its report of April 29, 1957, suggests the answer by means of chlorination and aeration.

Added diversion will not benefit navigation on the Illinois Waterway; it will affect adversely navigation on the Great Lakes. It will not solve the problem of sewage in the sanitary district. It will affect adversely the power authority and benefit the district power generation.

All these facts raise a Constitution issue of the power of Congress to authorize additional diversion. But if it should be constitutional—and only the Court can decide that—it certainly is unfair to injure the property rights of people in Michigan and Wisconsin and deprive navigation and downstream power interests of their rights solely for the economic benefit of the sanitary district.

Now that the Court has appointed a master, he should handle the matter. Perhaps it should be referred to the Commission under the authority of article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

Certainly diversion is unnecessary. It involves the rights, obligations and interests of the United States and Canada, as well as the litigating States and the inhabitants thereof.

REASONS FOR DENYING DIVERSION

1. The legislation will jeopardize our friendly relations with Canada. Canada is the best friend we have got in the world. Besides that she's our best neighbor, our best customer.

The two notes which follow, which I ask to be printed at the end of my remarks, clearly demonstrate how inappropriate it would be for Congress to take action.

2. The Great Lakes watershed: Canada and the United States are trustees thereof. If the door is opened now a flood of requests will come to the Congress from other communities along the St. Lawrence and in other States. Already the Ohio communities have discussed taking from Lake Erie water to the Ohio River watershed, and re-

cently a group of Texans has suggested that a pipeline be built to the Great Lakes to tap the water thereof.

3. The increase in diversion comes at a time when the Great Lakes are headed for a record low lake level. At a time when every inch of diversion accentuates great losses in shipping, hydroelectric power plants on the Niagara and St. Lawrence River and also the harbors of port cities.

4. We and Canada have put into the St. Lawrence development between us a billion dollars. The utilization of the Seaway requires high water levels. Chicago diversion will nullify, to some extent, the benefits derived from the St. Lawrence Seaway.

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS REPORT

1. The Engineers have stated that a temporary 3-year diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second would lower Lakes Michigan-Huron by five-eighths of an inch and Lakes Erie and Ontario would be lowered by three-eighths of an inch.

They also stated that an increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago would affect the flow and production of power in the Niagara River, the St. Lawrence River and in the Illinois hydroelectric plants—having an adverse effect on hydroelectric energy evaluated at \$408,000 to \$918,000.

2. The permanent diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second would have the effect of lowering the levels in Lake Michigan-Huron, and the estimated annual average economic loss to the U.S. Great Lakes fleet would be \$240,000.

3. The evidence of the chairman of the Power Authority of New York estimated by 1 year additional diversion at Chicago of 1,000 cubic feet per second the total loss to Canada and the power authority would be \$1,142,000, and as was suggested, it is plain that H.R. 1 is designed to open the door to a permanent additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second.

4. There has been plenty of evidence to show that the port cities of the Great Lakes would sustain very substantial damages to their harbors and port cities if H.R. 1 were to become law. Every fraction of an inch of loss in lake levels to artificially lower the Great Lakes due to a diversion at Chicago, would cost the lake port cities thousands of dollars annually.

5. The lake carriers testified that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago with the resultant lowering of the lake would result in a loss of approximately \$2,500,000.

CONCLUSION

1. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character.

2. Five States: Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and Wisconsin in 1955 approved the so-called Great Lakes Basin Compact, but Illinois Congressmen, following in the steps of their predecessors, kept on pressing Congress, even though the Supreme Court has returned and recently taken action and again appointed a master.

3. There are some real nice questions of law involved:

(a) Does Congress have the power to authorize the transfer of huge quantities of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed to the Mississippi watershed with substantial damage to the Great Lakes States, the municipalities located on the Great Lakes and their people?

(b) We believe—

(1) The Court in *Wisconsin v. Illinois*, 278 U.S. 367, has answered that question definitely. That it is beyond the power of Congress and the Federal Government, particularly when made to create an artificial waterway to divert water from one watershed to another.

(2) That the power in Congress goes to the constitutional provision to regulate com-

merce or navigation, and that sewage disposal or sanitation is not a legitimate object of legislation.

(3) Neither is the development of power at Lockport, Ill., a valid object under the Court's decision.

(4) Now that the Supreme Court has again appointed a master, it is the proper machinery to dispose of this matter.

(5) That the notes from Canada, with whom we have been at peace for 140 years, indicate a really substantial reason for Congress not to take action on this bill.

(6) That it is unconstitutional for Congress by additional diversion to prefer Chicago over the ports of the other States.

(7) That an additional diversion would work injury to the other States by depriving them and their citizens and property owners and property without the due process of law (278 U.S. 367).

(8) That, in accordance with the testimony of Colonel Nauman, of the Corps of Engineers, additional diversion is not needed on the 9-foot channel of the Illinois Waterway.

(9) That taking water from Lake Michigan and transferring it to another watershed to the detriment of the first watershed is neither just, legal, nor equitable.

(10) That the only permanent and effective way of cleaning up the drainage canal and the Illinois River is by keeping out of them any untreated, or partially treated, and other material that pollutes the water.

4. The International Joint Commission has definitely stated that if any increased diversion will have the effect of partially lowering the levels of the boundary waters, that it is not within the Congress to attempt to change the amount of the present authorized diversion. Under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, our two nations divested themselves of all authority over the boundary waters as far as raising, lowering, or diverting them were concerned.

Let me recapitulate. Aside from the question of jurisdiction and power of Congress in the premises, no necessity or justifiable excuse exists for increasing the diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system through the Chicago drainage canal.

1. The Great Lakes are international waters and no additional diversion should be permitted without the agreement of Canada and the States bordering on the Great Lakes;

2. The Illinois Waterway has more than enough water to handle all of the traffic and freight available and last year handled about 22 million tons of cargo;

3. Additional water diverted from Lake Michigan would not stop any erosion to riparian property on the Great Lakes due to high waters and winds; other means to minimize such damages are effective;

4. The Great Lakes are now in the downward movement of the cycle, with Lake Michigan 5 feet lower today than in August of 1952, and the Great Lakes will have new levels for the next years;

5. Additional diversion will not clean up any objectionable conditions in the Illinois Waterway as long as the Sanitary District of Chicago and industries, municipalities, and individuals continue to dump raw or partially treated sewage, chemicals and other materials in the waterway;

6. Any additional diversion will result in large and continuing damages to the Great Lakes and municipalities on the Great Lakes and their peoples, as witnesses and the United States Supreme Court pointed out;

7. Chicago today has no health problem related to the diversion issue;

8. President Eisenhower in his veto message of September 3, 1954, and in his veto in 1956, set forth succinctly the reasons why additional water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal should not be authorized by Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 11, p. 15304.)

9. The State of Illinois has, as a matter of official State policy as evidenced in its adoption of the Great Lakes Basin compact, recognized the justice and desirability of settling the Chicago water diversion controversy by agreement among all of the affected States and Canadian provinces, and not by Federal legislation. President Eisenhower, in his September 1954 veto of the diversion bill, indicated that he approved of an agreement between the interested Great Lakes States before authorizing additional diversion.

How Long Can the Benevolent Philosophy of Foreign Aid Continue To Blind Us to the Reality of Its Failures?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reality is the only means of discriminating between the virtues of benevolence and the sin of misdirected charity.

The foreign aid program most certainly was conceived in a sincere sense of virtuous benevolence. Its history in recent years reflects a sense of indiscriminate charity. Millions of Americans who have been burdened with the expense of this program regard the realities of its colossal waste and failures as reason to bring it to an end either immediately or in the near future. Countless others seem to be willing to accept it as a permanent program for reasons varying from benevolence to the calculated desire to maintain allies. Hence foreign aid has become an issue of deep controversy and one which will more than likely culminate in its slow death if the increasing number of votes in opposition to the program continues in the Congress in the years ahead. By its very nature, foreign aid is doomed—perhaps within 5 years and possibly 10.

There are those who justifiably fear that this program must be continued as long as the world is engaged in a titanic struggle between the forces of capitalism and communism. Be that as it may, no conscientious legislator can view the colossal waste and failures, so vividly revealed in committee investigations, without deep reservations. Neither can any conscientious legislator simply look the other way and blindly assume that we cannot turn back to some path of good judgment in this area of international life.

The U.S. Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, told a House committee investigating foreign aid earlier this year that military and other overseas spending agencies of the U.S. Government have had more money to hand out than they can judiciously plan and use. Certainly a man in this high position, whose competence has never been questioned, would make no such statement without fact and knowledge.

Just what are some of the things which prevent some Members of Congress from voting "Yes" on foreign aid

appropriations? In a number of countries, for example, the major item of expenditure is for training and supplying of a native army. One of these places happens to be Laos, in southeast Asia, now the center of a Communist-inspired rebellion. Representative PASSMAN testified that we supplied funds for maintaining an army of 25,000, but that U.S. military inspectors have never been permitted to find out just what kind of an army does exist there, if any.

But even if no army exists, there is plenty of evidence that there are uniforms, warehouses full of them. Among the thousands of uniforms waiting to be worn there were sizes 44 to 46. Each one of these, it appears, could accommodate two Lao soldiers since the average Lao weighs about 115 pounds and is 5 feet 3 inches tall.

In one depot overseas investigators discovered a 20-year supply of WAC clothing. At another place 70,000 sets of new tire chains were left out of doors to rust. Enough of one ammunition item to last for 185 years was found at a supply base. A 45-year supply of 30-carbine ammunition was uncovered at a military school in another foreign country. Then there was a motor pool which revealed the hoarding of 44 tires for each truck there. U.S.-equipped factories to build airplanes for the personal use of officials, it was found, were getting part of the foreign aid money.

Aid to foreign countries includes the stationing of U.S. missions to supervise the distribution of the funds and materials. While these supervisors are powerless to control the stealing, they are not without power to live sumptuously themselves. The Comptroller General told of some goings-on in Pakistan. There, for 271 Americans, the United States sent 529 refrigerators costing about \$105,800. Since the 271 included wives and children, it is obvious that for each American more than two refrigerators had been supplied. There were also 669 air conditioners valued at \$135,600; 650 stoves at \$47,100, and household furniture at \$128,500.

To bolster an apparently unpopular Pakistanian Government and win its support from the people, the United States decided to build in that country an installation which would supply a billion gallons of water a day for irrigation. A Japanese firm was engaged to do the job and over a million dollars was appropriated. When the pump house was completed it was discovered that there had been insufficient study of the problems to be solved, that the pumps would not be able to withstand the silt and mud and that the whole project was therefore useless as it stood.

Of Burma, Representative PASSMAN said:

When you go into a country and you cannot find any trace of any benefit from that program, you wonder what we did teach them while we were there.

After hearing how much has been poured into Okinawa and other Ryukyu Islands, Representative CONTE asked of a testifying general whether these moneys had gained us the support of the people of these U.S.-occupied Japanese

islands. The general asked that his answer be kept off the record. It was:

Perhaps one of the most authentic and striking appraisals of foreign aid recently came through Max A. Thurn-Valsassins, a member of the Austrian finance ministry and a former consultant to the World Bank.

Our foreign aid, he says, is based on three idealistic assumptions that are peculiar to the United States: that it will help underdeveloped countries raise their standard of living, that this will make them more stable, and that this, in turn, will contribute to American security.

Europe—

He says—

may be just as conscious of the Russian threat. It may have just as much to lose if the underdeveloped countries fall under Russian domination. Yet, in Europe, economic development has not aroused the big popular concern that exists in America.

The reason is not lack of money, he says. Some European countries could now afford foreign aid programs of their own. Instead, they let the United States struggle along under its self-imposed burden.

It is inconsistent, he says, for Americans to think that they can foster free enterprise, which they regard as essential to rising production, by giving money to rulers who regard our aid only as an instrument for subjecting the productive forces of their countries to their political and ideological objectives. These rulers resent any conditions or supervision accompanying our aid, and without these reins the money will go to build up public ownership and State control—the same things Russia deliberately fosters with her aid.

Such a system—

He says—

is incompatible with western type political and legal institutions. Unless present policies are altered, these institutions will become progressively weaker. Their final collapse may mean the end of western influence.

What underdeveloped countries need first, he says, is not money; indeed many Latin Americans have been investing large amounts in the United States while their governments are crying for investment capital. What they do need, he says, is a legal and institutional framework which will repatriate local capital and attract new investment from abroad. Lack of capital, he says, is not the cause of underdevelopment; rather, it is the consequence.

Developing this framework, he says, will require time, tact, and patience. But without it, foreign aid will remain futile, and, once it is accomplished, foreign aid will probably be unnecessary. This logic will probably not appeal to foreign aid lobbyists who think that with a generous dose of dollar bills, they can mold Asians and Africans into the image of Americans.

In the final analysis, it might be said that the answer to an effective foreign aid program lies in its proper administration. Perhaps this is true. But, how can a nation administer a foreign aid

program when it has little or no control over the distribution of such aid it renders once the gift has been made to another nation? One does not give gifts with the positive direction of their use by their recipients. If the United States has no control over the distribution of economic assistance, nor the right to investigate military assistance given to foreign nations, how can we possibly direct a successful foreign aid program? As a matter of fact, even if we were able to clean up the waste and corruption in the controlled phase of its administration, we would have no means of channeling the gifts of foreign aid to the areas of need. We cannot blindly place a label of benevolence on indiscriminate charity.

Trade Adjustment Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements legislation has always had my enthusiastic support. For at least a generation it has been evident to most Americans that the lowering of tariff barriers must be systematically pursued if the United States is to measure up to the demands of world leadership economically as well as politically.

At the same time it has long seemed unfair to me to expect a certain few industries in this country to bear the major burden of our national trade policy. It cannot be denied that the economic reversals suffered by many communities have resulted from tariff reductions.

I believe it is the responsibility of this Congress to ease the adverse effects of our national trade policy on previously healthy sectors of our economy. I am deeply convinced that we should provide temporary assistance to those stricken industries, communities, and individuals that find aid necessary as they attempt to diversify or expand their economic base.

Today I have introduced a trade adjustment bill which I hope may help serve as a focus for discussion in advance of the reconvening of Congress in January.

The objective of the bill is not to subsidize the adversely affected communities and firms or to compensate them for injury. Instead its aim is to help them adjust to new conditions within the framework of our trade policy—either by assisting them to make more effective use of their present facilities or by aiding the development of new lines of production.

The area redevelopment bill passed by the Senate earlier in this session contained an amendment which would have been a first step toward such a program of trade adjustment. This amendment

would have authorized governmental assistance for industries and communities as they adjust their productive activities to the new economic conditions created by the lowering of trade barriers. The amendment would have encouraged the President to use every governmental procedure presently available to facilitate the adjustment process.

Unfortunately this amendment is not contained in the area redevelopment bill reported out by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. As a result there is little constructive legislation before this house designed to alleviate the conditions of depressed areas suffering specifically because of our overall national trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today is a comprehensive measure to provide governmental assistance to those communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals adversely affected by our reciprocal trade program.

Briefly, this bill would provide help from the Federal Government to retrain individuals for new jobs, to render technical and financial assistance for conversion of plants to new items of production, and to assist communities in their efforts to attract new types of industry.

In the past when imports have reached the so-called peril-point threatening a domestic industry, great pressure has been brought to bear upon the Tariff Commission for restoration of tariffs or imposition of quotas. It is my belief that the executive branch should be provided with another alternative in such situations. It should be able to assist these businesses, industries, and communities as they attempt to adjust to newly created economic conditions.

What I propose in this bill is the establishment of an interdepartmental committee, the Trade Adjustment Board. As an alternative to the acceptance of peril-point and escape-clause recommendations, the President could turn the matter over to this Trade Adjustment Board.

Upon application by a community, an industrial development corporation, a business enterprise, an employee, or a union, the Board could determine whether the applicant had been adversely affected by the lowering of trade barriers. If the Board decided that the applicant had been so injured, many different forms of assistance could be made available.

By shifting the point of adjustment from the tariff itself to the particular community, firm, or individual claiming injury, an equitable trade policy would both encourage the expansion of foreign trade and at the same time minimize the extent of possible injury to the domestic economy.

My bill would provide an orderly and direct means of supplying technical advice and information to seriously afflicted communities.

Another type of aid would be granted in the form of loans. These loans could be made available through the regular procedures of the Small Business Administration.

Firms and communities would also be allowed accelerated amortization in order that they might readily develop new or different lines of production.

Finally, this bill would also provide several types of aid to individual workers who lose their jobs because of our trade policy.

The first assistance granted to these individuals would take the form of additional unemployment compensation. The bill would authorize the supplementing of State benefits from Federal funds. A worker, under this bill, could receive two-thirds of his weekly pay for 52 weeks. This unemployment compensation would, of course, be a stopgap measure, providing benefits only until other employment was available.

If a worker is over 60 years of age when he loses his job through the operation of international trade, and if he cannot get another job because of his age, this bill would allow him to retire under the Social Security Act.

Other workers, however, with many productive years ahead would be provided with an opportunity to receive retraining in skills that are in demand by the national economy.

This trade adjustment program is not a subsidy. It is not permanent assistance enabling industries or communities to hobble along. It is temporary assistance designed to help them over a period of adjustment.

If we believe that world trade is crucial to the future economic health of our Nation, as everyone by now should be convinced it is, then anyone seriously injured in the pursuit of this policy should be eligible to receive aid in order that he might change operations and again become productive.

In the field of veterans' legislation, we refer to a "service-connected disability." That is the way I regard the sacrifices which some of our industries have had to make as we pursue the legitimate objectives of our national trade policy.

It is the responsibility of Congress, I believe, to provide temporary assistance to those trade-affected communities, industries and individuals that need and can use aid as they attempt to diversify or expand their economic base. This bill would not subsidize obsolete plants. It would assist them to make more effective use of their present facilities or aid them in switching to new lines of production.

Mr. Speaker, trade adjustment is not an untried idea. It has been tried and found workable.

I refer to the experience of the European coal and steel community. It was recognized by the farsighted men who set up this first major venture in international administration of economic resources that hardship would fall to certain areas because of greater productivity through technical development and shifts in the centers of production.

So the conception of readaptation was evolved and put into operation in 1952. Readaptation in the European coal and steel community offers aid to disadvantaged firms and workers similar to those proposed in my trade adjustment bill. This European program by and large has met with success. The recent treaty establishing the European economic community has continued the concept of adjustment assistance in areas affected by the reduction of trade barriers.

This concept of readjustment assistance recognizes that our American economy is able to adapt its productive capacities in order to meet changing conditions. We see this adaptability in action every day as American industry modifies itself so that it may assimilate new products or technological improvements.

Here is a partial but constructive solution for an ancient dilemma which has often plagued Members of Congress. Those who wish to lower tariffs should support trade adjustment for they do not want any domestic interest to be injured. At the same time those who are legitimately concerned about some particular industry or community should find in this trade-adjustment bill a way to assist these individual enterprises while at the same time furthering the overall national interest by increasing world trade.

Everyone should now be aware of our true national interest. The easy argument against foreign imports has prevailed too long. If it results in a further weakening of our trade policy we may all suffer gravely in the future. Totalitarian nations will continue to make inroads into the free world as their trade offensive succeeds beyond their greatest hopes. Our alliances will falter over trade antagonisms. Our domestic economy will decline and American laborers will be out of work as other nations are no longer able to buy our products.

None of these things need happen, of course. A policy of trade adjustment provides the means whereby the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act can be strengthened, not weakened. Under it our trade with the world can continue to increase. Only a vigorous trade program of this sort will keep together a strong free world and promote a continually rising living standard for us all.

Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a sense of loss at the reassignment of Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher, Air Force Director of Legislative Liaison. I congratulate him, however, upon his forthcoming assignment, that of commander of the Eastern Air Force of the renowned Military Air Transport Service.

General Fisher is a man of unusual experience and capacity as a commander, beginning with his leadership of the 28th Bomb Squadron, 19th Bomb Group which experienced the Japanese attack on the Philippines in December 1941 and survived.

His great capacity as a leader was notable during his service in the extremely challenging duties which he has had here in Washington. General Fisher is a man respected and admired for his

calm, straightforward manner of doing business. His integrity is unquestioned. He has promoted with distinction the cooperative relationship which exists between the Congress and the U.S. Air Force.

I take this opportunity to welcome his successor as Director of Legislative Liaison, Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., who is also an officer of the highest ability.

**America's Religious Freedom Omitted
From U.S. Exhibit in Moscow**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, August 21, 1959, describing the American Exhibition in Moscow.

I think all of you will agree that the Christian Science Monitor is one of the most highly respected newspapers in America, and it is safe to presume that the reports of this newspaper's correspondents are factual and trustworthy.

It is because I have such profound confidence in the integrity of this newspaper that I was particularly disturbed about the following paragraph which was part of the story about the American Exhibit in Moscow in the August 21 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The paragraph stated:

There are also reports that many Soviet visitors have been both perplexed and disappointed that there was not more on religion and religious life in the United States at the exhibition.

It is indeed ironic that the following paragraph in this story is as follows:

But in certain areas visitors' opinions appear to be highly favorable. One of these is the hi-fi area, which attracts a large number of young people who know a great deal about American music, particularly jazz.

While I have no reason to question the accuracy of the Christian Science Monitor report, in order to assure myself that this report was indeed correct, I sent an inquiry to Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, who only last week returned from an inspection of the American Exhibit in Moscow. I should like to point out here that Mr. Canham is also president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In answer to my inquiry, Mr. Canham was kind enough to forward me the following reply:

Yes, I agree that religious life in America could have been more effectively and explicitly presented. However, there were many pitfalls, including denominational pressures and probably difficulties with the Soviets. It is a subtle problem, since we need to persuade Russians of the real meaning of religion and religious freedom to Americans, not just formal worship as they have known it. It is gratifying that Ameri-

can guides and specialists have often been able to give meaningful and impressive answers to religious questions asked by Soviet visitors.

It is of particular interest to me that in his reply, Mr. Canham does confirm the fact that the Russian people are obviously asking questions about religion in America.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of these two reports, the Office of the American National Exhibition in Moscow has broken faith with me and the other Members of this Congress.

I should like to recall here that on May 1, 1959, the general manager of the American exhibition, Mr. Harold C. McClellan, assured me in a rather lengthy letter that the "pervasive influence of religion throughout the American society" would be adequately included in the exhibit.

For some time prior to receipt of Mr. McClellan's assurance, I had carried on considerable negotiations with both Mr. McClellan and the U.S. Information Agency to impress on these people that it is my firm belief that the American exhibit should show the Russian people the real dynamics of religious freedom as we know them in this country.

I had pointed out to Mr. McClellan and his associates that the very cornerstone of our freedom in the United States is our deep belief in the Almighty, and I had urged Mr. McClellan to provide perhaps a special exhibit dealing with the subject. Throughout my discussions with Mr. McClellan and his associates, I tried to impress the fact that millions of Russian people who will visit this American exhibit should be made aware that the very basis of our Republic is the spiritual foundation which gives us understanding and compassion in dealing with each other as Americans.

It was on the basis of my firm position on this subject that I received an assurance from Mr. McClellan by letter on May 1 that "we shall do our best to reflect properly the religious side of American life."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of this article in the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. McClellan has not kept his word, and I strongly urge that the appropriate committee of this Congress undertake a full investigation to ascertain what factors came into play in omitting this very important aspect of our American life in the exhibit at Moscow.

Ever since the exhibit opened, we have seen press reports of severe censorship of the entire exhibition by Soviet officials. We have seen that our American authorities were not given a free hand in preparing the exhibit so that it would reflect the full meaning of freedom in this country. Only the other day the press carried stories that American officials were compelled to remove a photograph of a hungry child in China holding a bowl of rice.

It was my understanding that some 13 million American dollars have been spent on this exhibit, and I think it is the duty of this Congress to find out what factors were influential when the

original agreement for this exhibition was reached with the Soviet authorities. It is my firm conviction that some study should be given to just how much backbone and stamina our American representatives have in dealing with the Soviet Union. There is no question in my mind that if they yield to the Soviet Union on the subject of an exhibit such as the one we are now financing in Moscow, then I hardly think they are capable of dealing with the Soviets on the more profound problems facing the survival of civilization.

I am deeply concerned that those who have set up this exhibit have put their greatest emphasis on the material wealth of America when actually our greatest strength as a nation lies in our spiritual foundation—our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, our freedom of elections, our freedom of religion, our freedom of assembly.

I need not tell you how chagrined I am that while the organizers of this exhibit could not find sufficient space to tell the Soviet people about our great religious freedom, they did find sufficient resources to emphasize hi-fi and jazz.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing the entire text of Mr. McClellan's letter to me of May 1, 1959:

OFFICE OF AMERICAN NATIONAL
EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW,
May 1, 1959.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: I acknowledge receipt of your thoughtful letter of April 24 in reference to our conversation concerning the presentation of religion in the American National Exhibition in Moscow this summer.

I have reviewed your letter and its enclosures very carefully and have discussed them with the policy experts on my staff and elsewhere in the executive branch of the Government. It remains my best judgment that we should not present a separate religious exhibit at Moscow, but rather that we should portray the pervasive influence of religion throughout the American society.

I recently returned from Moscow where I have reviewed our plans with Ambassador Thompson, his top officials, and our own exhibit staff. I believe in all sincerity that we are following the proper approach.

I should like to give you an idea of some of the ways we intend to present religion in the exhibit.

1. One of the most striking features of the architectural exhibit will be a set of panels devoted to churches and the creativity of American architecture in the religious tradition.

2. The two motion pictures to be shown at the exhibit will contain photographs of churches and people entering these churches. These two motion pictures are Circarama and the special seven-screen documentary on American life presently under production by Charles Eames.

3. There will be religious literature at the exhibition in the book, magazine, and newspaper section.

4. There will be an exhibit of university catalogs in which courses in religion will appear. There will also be a certain number of catalogs of theological schools.

5. There will be a considerable number of questions in the Ramac electronic calculating machine concerning statistics and information on religion in American life. I cannot yet tell you how many questions because they are still being prepared in the U.S. Information Agency.

6. The exhibit on the American worker in community life will contain photographs and

textual material on religious life in the community.

7. There will be some paintings with religious themes in the painting exhibit.

8. The large photographic exhibit, entitled "The Family of Man," has a considerable number of photographs depicting human belief in God.

9. The Gallery of Americans, which is a special exhibit composed of photographs of famous Americans, will include several of the national figures mentioned in your attachment and will include quotations which refer to the subject of religion.

10. Religious music will be included as part of the musical programs presented in both the high-fidelity area and the outside rest area.

Please accept again my appreciation of the time and thought you have given this problem and my assurance that we shall do our best to reflect properly the religious side of American life.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD C. MCCLELLAN,
General Manager.

Luther Burbank Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, I was privileged to participate in the simple, but impressive, exercises marking the dedication of the Luther Burbank monument at Fort Devens.

The exercises took place in that portion of Fort Devens which was once part of the town of Lancaster, where Luther Burbank was born and where he spent the early years of his life. The site of his home was cleared by Army officials at Fort Devens and planted with sugar maples and flowers. A 4-foot obelisk, which was unveiled Saturday, marks the site of the Burbank homestead. The obelisk is inset with a plaque commemorating the site, which will be open to the public for picnicking with the permission of the provost marshal at Fort Devens.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my address at the dedication ceremonies.

The material follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN
AT DEDICATION OF LUTHER BURBANK MEMORIAL, LANCASTER, AUGUST 29, 1959

It is an honor and a happy privilege for me to join you today in paying appropriate tribute to the great Luther Burbank.

Thanks to the wisdom and patriotism of distinguished officials of the town of Lancaster and the incomparably splendid and outstanding leader of our military forces of the Army, General Wooten, we are proud to come here today to this hallowed spot to dedicate this beautiful, lasting memorial to one of history's great geniuses who first saw the light of day here where we gather.

I cannot give too much credit today to Lancaster town officials and leaders, Mr. Burgoyne and the board of selectmen, Rev. John M. O'Brien, Mr. Griswold, Chief Ryder, and to General Wooten and Colonel Rutledge and others interested in this fine project, because without their devoted interest, work, and co-

operation, today's commemoration would not have been possible.

It is all the more creditable, desirable, and praiseworthy that we should establish this memorial because in a nation and a world which more and more tends to frown upon tradition and the virtues and glorious achievements of the past as an inspiration and fitting accompaniment to present and future accomplishments, it is all the more appropriate and helpful that we should add this historic shrine raised in honor of the great Burbank to the many of which Lancaster may boast.

My good and distinguished friends, Mrs. Esther B. MacDonald, town clerk of Lancaster, and Mrs. Marion Safford, gifted historian of the town, in their diligence and kindness have on other occasions furnished me with comprehensive biographical information on the life of Luther Burbank which I was happy and proud to use in speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, first on his 100th birthday and again at the time of the Lancaster tricentennial celebration.

Luther Burbank was born in Lancaster March 7, 1849, the son of Samuel Walton Burbank and Olive Ross Burbank, the 13th child in the family. His father was a prosperous farmer and a maker of brick and pottery.

From his mother, Luther apparently inherited his love of nature, particularly his love of flowers.

He attended the Pine Grove School, a typical New England school in the north part of Lancaster.

When he was 15 years of age he entered Lancaster Academy where he studied for four winters, all the while making good use of the excellent library which, even at such an early date, the progressive and educational-minded people of Lancaster had provided to inculcate and encourage learning in the community.

From his work on the farm Luther early gained a practical knowledge of the life, characteristics and growth of plants.

Sometime after his father's death he purchased a 17-acre farm in Lunenburg where he took up the business of market gardening. It was here that this great genius first produced in quantity his first new plant creation—the Burbank potato.

According to Mrs. Safford he was a quiet, reticent youth who frequently was seen walking along the streets of the town with his hands folded behind his back, apparently in deep thought and in a contemplative mood.

He bred this new species of potato from seed which he found in his garden and sold his crop of seed potatoes to a marketing firm in Boston.

In 1875 when he was about 26 years of age, he sold his farm and went to California where his three older brothers resided, taking with him the capital from the sale of the farm and a small quantity of his newly created potatoes.

His subsequent experiments and creations cover a very wide range and produced revolutionary changes in plant life and methods of cultivation in orchard, garden, field and forest.

Burbank discovered new ways of choosing and caring for seeds, preparing the soil, planting, disease and pest prevention.

He created many new species of berries, fruits, vegetables, and flowers, amazing and unbelievable to botanists and horticulturists.

He improved the size and quality of many species. He utilized grafting to promote startling changes in garden, orchard, and forest.

I could not begin to enumerate his remarkable accomplishments here, but they were epochal, monumental and of lasting value to mankind. Luther Burbank will always be remembered as one of our greatest scientists and one of our greatest Americans.

It is interesting to note that the house where Luther Burbank was born, right here on this very site that we are commemorating today, a large New England style brick home with a wooden ell was razed by the Government when it took over this section of the town to extend Fort Devens during World War II.

Another great American benefactor, Mr. Henry Ford, had purchased the ell of the house some years before and removed it to Dearborn, Mich.

Luther Burbank was born on the second floor in a small room of this ell. Some years ago I talked about Luther Burbank with two of his old schoolmates who long resided in our district, the brothers Fred W. and Luther Bateman, both very prominent and highly respected citizens.

Mr. Fred Bateman who knew Burbank intimately and well, was a famed, successful civil engineer, who even when he was over 90 years of age continued to work daily at his profession. These good men were of the opinion that in his early years Burbank showed great genius and was a painstaking, resourceful experimenter.

The American people, indeed the people of the world have received lasting benefits from the brilliant research and miraculous achievements of Luther Burbank and we are indeed honored today to pay this additional heartfelt tribute to his memory, and express our renewed appreciation for his magnificent work in behalf of science and humanity.

Luther Burbank was the product of this proud, rugged, Lancaster environment, of hardworking people and he unquestionably derived much of his skill and genius from the frugal, industrious habits, willingness to perform hard work and tenacious purpose from his rugged New England forbears and from the favorable, encouraging climate of this distinguished and progressive town of Lancaster.

It was here that he had his humble beginning, got his early training and drew deep inspiration.

It was here that the hand of destiny first placed upon his brow the diadem of genius and greatness.

It was here amidst the eternal, green hills, fertile valleys, and beautiful countryside of old New England where American liberty was nurtured and where its spirit still animates the hearts and minds of the people, that Luther Burbank's brilliant work found its source and its stimulus.

It is for us and succeeding generations to keep in mind and to perpetuate the great spiritual values which are represented in and responsible for the illustrious career of Burbank and his service to humanity—his profound belief in the Almighty, his reverence for free institutions and his faith in himself which led him to lasting fame and, more than that, enabled him to contribute so mightily to the welfare and happiness of people of every race, color and creed the world over.

Among Burbank's most beautiful creations was the Shasta daisy which the people and the schoolchildren of Lancaster and of his adopted home in California believe should become the national flower of our country.

It is fitting on this occasion that we should make reference to this beautiful flower because of all his creations it perhaps best exemplifies the hardy, unconquerable spirit of the great Luther Burbank. May we of this troubled time draw courage and inspiration from the homely virtues and patriotism of Luther Burbank. May his fine example and brilliant achievements long continue to inspire and guide us in the perpetuation of freedom, justice, and peace.

This is probably the last occasion upon which our distinguished friend, General Wooten, will be officially with us. He has been promoted to a much higher post of responsibility in our great Army and, in time,

because of his great talents, ability and high purpose he will undoubtedly go right to the very top of his proud calling.

We are all greatly indebted to this great American soldier, not only for his peerless service at Fort Devens, but also for his warm friendship, the interest he has taken in our community affairs, the effective cooperation which he has always given us.

Though we all rejoice in his promotion, we are very sorry to have him leave this district where he has made so many friends and where he is so highly esteemed and beloved. We hope he will return often to see us.

In behalf of our district, our people and myself I wish to express to him today our sincere and deep gratitude for his many contributions, congratulations upon his advancement and very best wishes to him and his family for many more happy, constructive years in the service of our great Nation.

May the memory and achievements of Luther Burbank long continue to inspire our people and to nurture and develop more great men from our midst to serve wholeheartedly and unselfishly in the tasks and the cause of peace.

Exercises Commemorating and Honoring the Memory of Father Junipero Serra, O.F.M., 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, there stands in Statuary Hall here in the Nation's Capitol a statue of Father Junipero Serra as one of California's distinguished sons. On Friday, August 28, at 10 a.m., ceremonies commemorating the 175th anniversary of Father Serra's death were held in front of the statue. Present were all of the California Members of the House, California's two distinguished Senators, the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va., members of the clergy, and others.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith the remarks made by the several speakers:

EXERCISES COMMEMORATING AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA, O.F.M., 175TH ANNIVERSARY, STATUARY HALL, AUGUST 28, 1959

The commemoration and the laying of wreaths at the statue of Padre Junipero Serra was held at Statuary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C., on Friday, August 28, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

Dr. William T. Doran, Jr., president of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va., presided.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, the ceremonies commemorating and honoring the memory of Father Junipero Serra, O.F.M., on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of his death will begin with the invocation. This will be given by Father Noel F. Moholy, O.F.M., of Santa Barbara, Calif., the vice postulator for the cause of Father Serra. Father Moholy.

INVOCATION

O God in heaven above, Supreme Master and Sovereign Lord, we praise Thee, we bless Thee, we adore Thee for Thy great glory. We beg Thee, Provident Father of us all, to turn Thy benign countenance upon this assemblage honoring one of America's pioneers. We beg of Thee the signs and prodigies

which will show indisputably, to the glory of Thy name, that he is a saint in heaven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Your Excellency, distinguished participants in the ceremony, Members of Congress from the Senate and House of Representatives, it is with great pride that I, as chairman, welcome you here this morning on behalf of the cosponsors of this ceremony: the Members of Congress from California and the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va. It is fitting to the memory of Father Serra that we acknowledge the presence here of our distinguished guests. Would that time permitted to mention everyone here because all present represent prominent and cultural groups and include: Knights of Saint Gregory, Knights of Malta, Knights of the Holy Sepulchre. It is with sincere pride and grateful acknowledgment that I mention those whose presence emphasizes the national and international recognition of California's first citizen and man of God's choosing. Representing the executive branch of our Government is Serran James O'Connell, Montclair, N.J., the Under Secretary of Labor. Among the Congressmen is Serran DONALD IRWIN, U.S. Representative from Connecticut. Representing Spain we are honored to have (Spain being the place of Father Serra's birth), the Honorable Enrique Suarez de Puga, Secretary for Cultural Affairs of the Embassy. Representing Mexico, our sister country to the south, and the place of Father Serra's early missionary work, is the Honorable Juan Gallardo, Chargé d'Affaires, and Mr. Luis G. Aveleyra, also of the Embassy. Representing the Pan American Union, is Dr. Juan Marin, Director of the Department of Cultural Affairs, Dr. Javier Malagon, and others. Dr. Manuel Martinez of the Department of Latin-American History of Georgetown University is representing the Spanish-American Historical Societies. Monsignor Magner is representing Catholic University. Father Durkin is representing Georgetown University. Mr. Homer Hammond represents the National Council of Catholic Men; former Congressman John Costello, the Holy Name Society; Mr. Gerald Mooney, Ancient Order of Hibernians; Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mr. Valentine Matellis, the Knights of Columbus. Father Frank Hurley represents the National Catholic Welfare Council. There are representatives of the various Catholic religious orders. Serra clubs of Serra International, are represented here this morning, from California to New Jersey, Massachusetts to Texas. Past President Thomas Reilly of Serra International, is here with us. Father (brigadier general) Walsh, U.S. Army (retired), represents the diocese of Richmond, Va., recognizing California's saintly pioneer. There are greetings; two of these I will read.

HON. JOHN SHELLEY, AUGUST 26, 1959.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I am with you in spirit on the occasion of the commemoration in the National Capitol of the 175th anniversary of the death of Padre Junipero Serra. May God grant our Nation may soon be honored by the inscription of the name of California's founder and apostle in the Cannon of the Saints.

A. J. WILLINGER,
Bishop of Monterey.

FRESNO, CALIF.

HON. JOHN SHELLEY, AUGUST 26, 1959.
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Franciscan Fathers of California express sincere appreciation for commemorative observance for Padre Junipero Serra on this 175th year and rejoice at the honor accorded their founder who also laid first stones of culture and initiated progress which has come to such a peak of achievement in the Golden State.

Father DAVID TEMPLE,
Franciscan Province of Santa Barbara.
OAKLAND, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time I would like to introduce our first speaker, the Honorable JOHN SHELLEY, Congressman from San Francisco.

Congressman SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency Most Reverend Bishop Hannan, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignor, Reverend Fathers, representatives of the Governments of Spain and Mexico, my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and ladies and gentleman. It is first my privilege to read a couple of messages that were addressed to my office which arrived this morning:

AUGUST 26, 1959.

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is a privilege to join with the Serra Society on the occasion of the observance of the 175th anniversary of the passing of Father Junipero Serra. The people of San Francisco are continually aware of the tremendous contribution made to this area by Father Serra. Were it not for his saintly efforts, San Francisco and California would be lacking in many of our greatest spiritual assets. However, our indebtedness to Father Serra exceeds even the sphere of the church as evidenced by the many temporal accomplishments justly accredited to his untiring efforts. San Francisco's debt to Father Serra and his coworkers of nearly two centuries ago can never be fully repaid.

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER,
Mayor, San Francisco, Calif.

AUGUST 26, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.:

It is distinct pleasure to extend my warmest felicitations to the California legislators and the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir as you gather to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the death of Father Junipero Serra. In keeping his cherished memory alive you do a great service to the church and to the country. May the high ideals of this zealous apostle continue to inspire you and may God abundantly bless your devoted work.

Archbishop VAGNOZZI,
Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

AUGUST 27, 1959.

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand you will be present at ceremonies before statue of Junipero Serra. Would appreciate your acting as my representative and reading the following message:

It is fitting that in this year marking the 175th anniversary of Serra's death there be a program in his honor in the Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol. Father Junipero Serra is truly the first of the pioneers who inaugurated the history of civilized California. He personally established 9 of the 21 missions and made a host of other great contributions to the future of this State. The people of California owe him great and lasting honor and we appreciate the effort made by those of you present today.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

AUGUST 28, 1959.

HON. JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The Native Daughters of the Golden West extend congratulations to Fort Belvoir Serra Club for this observance honoring Junipero Serra whom we revere and honor as the founder of our missions and father of California. Our order recognizes the great con-

tribution Father Serra made to our State and we are happy to participate in this commemoration. I am proud to announce that we are beginning a project for the placement of a statue of Father Serra on the capitol grounds at Sacramento. The Native Sons of the Golden West will cosponsor this project with us. We will be happy to have assistance from other organizations or friends. I wish it were possible to be present for your program, but as it is not, I am delighted to have my daughter represent me and the Native Daughters of the Golden West.

MAXINE PORTER,
Grand President, NDGW.

A MESSAGE FROM JOHN B. SCHMOLLE, GRAND PRESIDENT, NATIVE SONS OF THE GOLDEN WEST, TO THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA AT STATUE OF FATHER SERRA IN STATUARY HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Father Junipero Serra—apostle of California—left an impact on the culture of the State which will live eternal. The simple kindness which emanated from this man of God still permeates the atmosphere of California. His development and plan of the chain of missions was done in a time and an era devoid of the materials and mechanical knowledge ordinarily attendant and available to structures even at that period.

Using the elements of nature and the products of the earth, coupled with the resourcefulness of a master builder, this man of God and his aids, drew on their storehouse of knowledge to erect in the primitive wilderness of California the buildings recognized by the civilized world as suitable habitations for the purpose they were to serve. All of the buildings still stand in one form or another—some in semirepair—some still in use. All are shrines, not only to the lover of history and the romantic period known as the Splendid Idle Forties, but also to the devout. Over 1 million tourists annually visit the missions of California.

The results of these buildings have been reflected over the entire history of California. In the architectural field the copyists refer to the buildings as mission style and replicas are still being built today, both for commercial and residential use, by people who have been enamored of this gracious form of building.

This diminutive man in body had the heart, mind, and spirit of a giant and symbolically represents the heart of California. As grand president of the Native Sons of the Golden West, it is my great privilege to write these few words honoring him, for he was a beacon and established a light that has never failed; the forerunner and possibly the reason for the greatest mass migration the world has ever known.

JOHN B. SCHMOLLE,
Grand President, Native Sons of the Golden West.

AUGUST 28, 1959.

Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

San Francisco Serra Club joins with you on the commemorative 175th anniversary of the death of our beloved patron Father Junipero Serra.

ALBERT E. MAGGIO,
President.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SHELLEY

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a television series called "I Led Three Lives." This same title is particularly applicable to the State's founder, Padre Junipero Serra, and is especially significant this year. The year 1959 marks the 175th anniversary of Father Serra's death, the 190th anniversary of his arrival in upper California, and the 210th an-

niversary of his departure from his homeland in Spain. The first 36 years of his life Padre Junipero Serra spent on his native island of Mallorca. There he entered the Franciscan Order in 1730. After obtaining the doctorate in sacred theology, he devoted some 10 years to a distinguished career of teaching, even occupying a chair in the Lullian University of St. Raymond. His ability as a professor was rivaled only by his popularity as a preacher. In 1749 Father Serra sailed to the New World to become a missionary. His first assignment was in the mountains, Sierra Gorda, where in some 9 years he could report that not a single unconverted Indian remained in the region. Eight more years he passed crisscrossing central Mexico preaching missions to the faithful. In 1768 he was appointed padre presidente of the chain of missions in lower California. The following year brought the fulfillment of his heart's desire when he was designated the pioneer priest to handle the Christianizing of upper California. Father Serra helped blaze the trail that is still known as El Camino Real and founded the first 9 of the missions that eventually became a chain of 21. In 1784 he concluded his threefold career which had been lived in three countries and in three realms of activity. Today the servant of God is known and revered throughout the world for his zeal and for his holiness, and tomorrow we hope that the church in her wisdom and her prudence will reward this reputation with her highest honor—the canonization of Father Serra as a saint.

It is now my privilege to present my colleague from California, the senior Senator from California, the Honorable THOMAS KUCHEL.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Representative SHELLEY. Your Excellency, reverend clergy, members of the diplomatic corps, my colleagues in the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, these services commemorate the life and labors of a Franciscan friar whose intrepid Christian ministrations were spread through a great primitive area before the United States came into being. Junipero Serra, Franciscan missionary from Mallorca, journeyed to the North American Continent in the 1750's, came to the city of Mexico and in the late 1760's went northward to upper California. In that northward trek, both he and his courageous, faithful and devoted companions, sowed in the hearts and in the minds of men, the seeds of a new civilization under the Divine Spirit. Father Serra brought with him the mission which meant the spread of religion in these unknown lands, the presidio which meant the expansion of the political and military control of Spain, and the pueblo (a town) which meant the establishment of orderly civil government. Here was a tripartite development both secular and spiritual. The hard trails which his weary feet traversed, from mission to mission, along the El Camino Real today continues to be the wayroad along which our strong great municipalities, great universities, great industry, great agriculture, and the great missions of his day—human progress in its every latest attainment. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, Father Serra departed this life. From a primitive unsettled land on the Pacific shore to which he came, has developed now a majestic center of cultural and economic life rich in all the bounty of God's nature, our magnificent State of California. While we honor Junipero Serra for the blessings of civilization which he left in California, we shall not forget that his was a spiritual labor. The missions he built, the agriculture he founded supported by irrigation systems which, incidentally, still excite the admiration of modern hydraulic engineers, were all means to an end. The sword was there to support the cross, and so was the civil au-

thority—but it was the cross which came first. Imbued with Divine Spirit, charged with an exalted mission and sustained by an unflinching faith—Father Serra brought to the Indians the civilizing message of Christian teachings. Here was the solid, sound foundation upon which all other building rested. It is well to recall this simple fact in our day, for we too have an exalted mission—to hold high the banner of man's freedom to protect it from all assaults from the ungodly and to advance it with God's grace by an unflinching faith in the righteousness of our purposes.

Congressman SHELLEY. Senator ENGLE, the junior Senator from California, was to have been here but was detained by a debate on the floor—that's his job—he has to be there. He has very graciously sent a very charming young lady from his office who will deliver the message of Senator ENGLE, of California.

SENATOR ENGLE'S ADDRESS

Your Excellency, reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, Mr. SHELLEY, Senator KUCHEL, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring the greetings and regrets of Senator ENGLE, who is now engaged in a major speech on the Senate floor which he was obliged to make at this hour, and he was especially sorry to miss this beautiful ceremony this morning. In his name, I would like to read a few remarks in tribute to Father Serra.

The highest honor any State can confer on a native son is to place his statue here in Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol. Each State has been most careful in the selection of the individuals it has placed here. If you visit the respective States, you will find the statue of their favorite son in numerous places there. The statue of Padre Junipero Serra, accordingly, is found throughout California, in public plazas and in private patios, before courthouses and in lush parks. Streets are named in his honor and buildings are dedicated in his memory. Schools, theaters, and a retreat house bear the name of Serra. Such honor you would more or less expect to find in the Golden State but you find a statue of the venerated Franciscan in the vestibule of St. Peter's Church in Chicago's Loop. You see his image on the facade of Holy Name College here in Washington as well as in mosaic at the new Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. You cannot miss his identity in the ceramic of the new church of St. Francis Xavier in Phoenix, Ariz., and he holds aloft the cross from the roof of Casa de Paz Ybien in the same Valley of the Sun. His statue stands on the tables as he presides at every meeting of Serra clubs throughout these United States, and as Serra International grows, his statue moves into foreign lands. If you travel to Mexico you will find him in the vestibule of the church of San Fernando College, the cradle from which California was born. His name and reputation are held in veneration throughout the land to our south. In Mallorca you will find his statue in the principal plaza of his native town. Throughout Spain his name is revered. And now in the eternal city of Rome itself, the new American Franciscan college currently under construction is to be known as Colegio Franciscano de Americano de Junipero Serra. Here is a true American success story. The annals of our history feature those who have risen from poverty to riches, from obscurity to influential positions in public life. Not a few immigrants to this country have landed on our shore penniless, uneducated, and uncultured. Lifting themselves by their own bootstraps in this land of equal opportunity to all, they have attained prominence and importance to truly amaze historian and biographer alike. Padre Junipero Serra born in the small village of Petra Mallorca, in the poorest section of that little town, his humble origin might have suggested that he follow in the family simple tradition of

farming. His illiterate background portended no brilliant future, yet under Franciscan tutelage first at San Bernardino in Petra, and later at San Francisco in Palma, he manifested such superior native talent and such proficiency in scientific work that he was awarded the doctorate in sacred theology and held the chair of theology in the renowned Lullian University of St. Raymond. All that he sacrificed when he sailed for the New World. While I would not here repeat the story of his life, I would underline his sharing of the American tradition. Although of poor and humble background, he rose to international preeminence. Today three countries claim him either as native son or adopted father. We Californians are justifiably proud to join with our Mallorcan friends in acclaiming him El Fundador de California—the founder of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor now to present Father Noel E. Moholoy, O.F.M., S.T.D., vice postulator for the cause of Padre Serra, from Santa Barbara, Calif.

ADDRESS BY REVEREND MOHOLAY, O.F.M., S.T.D.

Your Excellency Bishop Hannon, right reverend Monsignori, reverend fathers, Members of Congress, honored guests of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen, unable to stand or even to sit, the father now 55 years old lay restless on his bed of pain. Word spread throughout the camp quickly that Father Junipero Serra was ill. Don Gasparde Portala, the military commander of the expedition, immediately went to the friar's tent, appraised the situation realistically, and told the little padre that he would make arrangements immediately to have him transferred to San Fernando de Bellacepa, the mission Serra had founded 4 days previously. The pain disappeared instantaneously as the little Mallorcan reacted aghast: "No. If I die on the road, I'm still going to go." And he called the muleteer and asked him to apply the same tallow and herbs that he used on the pack animals. The next morning Junipero Serra celebrated mass and continued on to San Diego in the land of heart's desire. Frequently in the years that followed Serra was to manifest the same type of determination. When the entire colony in the spring of 1770 was preparing to leave, to abandon California, he was on Presidio Hill, in characteristic prayer begging that the relief ship *San Antonio* would arrive on time. But already a month previously he had served his ultimatum—"Though they all go back, I will remain here with Father Fray Juan (Crespi) to the bitter end." In answer to his prayer, the ship arrived, and he was revealing the watchword he had manifested in the farewell letter to his parents years before: "Always to go forward and never to turn back." He was an enthusiast and a zealot. To him the magnificent bay named in honor of St. Francis was a watery barrier hindering his progress for he envisioned missions as far north as Alaska in his own lifetime and commissioned expeditions to go there. For 15 years he labored in the area in the modern State of California working zealously planting nine of the crosses along El Camino Real, where weary Spaniard and wary Indian alike would find hospitality, nourishment for the body and heavenly food for the soul. And it was only when the Angel of Death hovered over his simple pallet that to his beloved son Carlos de Bormelo de Carmello he finally said: "I must take some rest." The West has always boasted that it is a land where men are men. Father Serra can well be said to have set the precedent. He rolled up his sleeves and went to work. California has accorded him her highest honor by placing his statue here in Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol. The Franciscan Fathers of California have been laboring for 18 years and longer to place around that head the halo of a saint.

Congressman SHELLEY. It is my privilege at this time, ladies and gentlemen, to present for remarks the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota, Senator McCARTHY.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

Mr. SHELLEY, Your Excellency, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignor, Reverend Fathers, representatives of the diplomatic corps, of the administration, my colleagues of the Senate, Senator KUCHEL and Members of the House, ladies and gentlemen, friends of the cause of Father Junipero Serra. It is truly a privilege for me, from Minnesota, and the U.S. Senate outside of the Californians to be here to participate in this program. I think that you of California and of the Serra Club and the Franciscans who have had Father Serra to themselves for so many years, must now come to accept that throughout this country and throughout the world, his great work has been known and his cause has many supporters as he has many followers. It may be significant that now that California is no longer the western frontier of the United States, that it is now in effect the geographical center of the country, that Father Serra will be accepted too, as standing in the center of this United States, and the things for which he stood become more widely known and more widely accepted. It is significant I think that he labored in California in the same years during which men of politics labored on this eastern coast to establish the institutions and the traditions which have been the strength of democratic society here in the United States. His approach, as has been said by others here before me, was somewhat different. His emphasis was on the cross and on the things of the spirit but his labors were not restricted to that field, because he knew, as well or better than any man, along with the things of the spirit, it was needed to have political order and economic and social order. So, dedicated to the cross and things of the spirit, he built these other institutions as men of politics establishing this United States sought to build political institutions and economic and social institutions which would establish the means and conditions out of which spiritual perfection might be achieved. So let me congratulate you, the friends of Father Serra, Californians, members of the Serra Club, and particularly the Franciscan Order and to express my hope that his particular cause, the cause of his canonization, may prosper, but along with that, and more important, the cause which he so well advanced in his own time will prosper even more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We of Serra and California, thank you Mr. McCARTHY for your remarks. Mr. Hubert Kelly, chairman of the special events committee, Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, will present the wreath laying ceremonies.

Mr. HUBERT KELLY. Thank you Dr. Doran. I shall first call upon Father Clebus Wheeler, Minister-Provincial of the Franciscan Order of Friars Minor to bless the floral offerings that we are about to present. Father Wheeler.

BLESSING

We ask of our Heavenly Father that He speed the cause of Father Serra, that He bless these wreaths we are about to put on the foot of his statue and that He bless us in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Mr. HUBERT KELLY. The first wreath will be presented for Serra International by Mr. Peter A. Mills, Knight of St. Gregory, Pittsburgh, Pa., the permanent chairman of the Father Serra Spiritual Observance Day, and past trustee of Serra International, and by Mr. Ralph Hauenstein of Grand Rapids, Mich., first vice president of Serra International.

Mr. Mills and Mr. Hauenstein thereupon placed a wreath at the foot of the Serra statue.

The second wreath will be presented for the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir by Mr. Joseph S. Hoffmann, Alexandria, Va., past president of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, and deputy district governor of district 19 of the Serra International, and Mr. Fiori J. Tamanini, also a past president of Serra Club at Fort Belvoir.

The second wreath was placed before the Serra statue by Mr. Hoffmann and Mr. Tamanini.

We will now call upon Father (Lieutenant Colonel) Pawlowicz, post chaplain of Fort Belvoir and acting chaplain of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir to make one final introduction before closing the ceremony with the Serran prayer. Father Pawlowicz.

Father PAWLOWICZ. I would like at this time to ask all the distinguished guests to remain seated until after the ceremony is over and also to call upon His Excellency, the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of Washington, D.C., to present benediction after the prayer of the Serrans.

PRAYER FOR VOCATIONS

O God who wills not the death of a sinner, but rather that he be converted and live, grant, we beseech Thee, through the intercession of the Blessed Mary, ever virgin, and all the saints, an increase of laborers for Thy church, fellow laborers with Christ, to spend and consume themselves for souls, through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

Bishop HANNAN. I think it is fitting on an occasion like this to recite the prayer of St. Francis, a prayer which certainly epitomizes the life of Father Serra. In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

PRAYER

Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the distinguished and honored guests please remain for the press and the photographers. The ceremony is ended.

Alaska's Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, of Alaska, recently participated in a most important meeting of short-haul airline operators in a twin city Alaskan appearance in Anchorage and Fairbanks, July 28 to July 31.

This meeting of the Association of Local Transport Airlines featured an address delivered by our distinguished committee member, Senator BARTLETT,

on Wednesday, July 29, 1959, in Anchorage, Alaska, saluting civil aviation in Alaska, past and present, and should be of the greatest interest to all the distinguished Members of this body.

Recognizing the active and most constructive aviation role my distinguished colleague has played in this, his first session as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator BARTLETT's address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, OF ALASKA, TO THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL TRANSPORT AIRLINES AT ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, JULY 29, 1959

I am exceedingly pleased to be here addressing you this evening, and want to thank you for honoring me with the invitation to take part in your winged visit to Alaska and to speak to you.

My friends from the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce will join me, I'm sure, in expressing our State's warmest welcome to you of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

I was all the more ready to accept this invitation to be with you of the association because it was extended to me by Col. Joseph P. Adams, general counsel and executive director of this splendid aviation group. I count it a privilege to name Joe Adams as a friend. Joe has a way of getting around on Capitol Hill and in the executive departments of Government which is just as effective as it is proper. Come to think of it, I wonder if all these local airlines would be in existence if it were not for Joe Adams. As a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who served the public interests faithfully and well, Joe insisted that the little fellow get a break. He prevailed. There were many times, I know, when it would have been easier for him to give up, and jettison his cargo, to lower his landing gear and set down in the face of the very formidable opposition which confronted him. But Joe is not that kind of a man. He persevered, and won out. The public won at the same time.

We Alaskans feel we have an important stake in your association. After all, 5 of the local service airlines that are lifelines in our farflung State form a rather substantial part of your membership of 16 companies. We remember, too, that you had the courtesy, when you first organized in 1957, to reflect Alaska in your original name—the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines. And I can well imagine that you were almost as pleased as we when the march of American history caused you to change that name by dropping the territorial reference.

For many long years "statehood" was a word that had a bitter flavor for us. Now it tastes deliciously sweet as it rolls off our tongues. I understand that statehood has been sweetening the balance sheets of the local service airlines in Alaska and Hawaii, too, by booming the business and tourist traffic. For the benefit of any Civil Aeronautics Board auditors who may be within earshot, let it be stated that this comes to me strictly as rumor. I haven't examined a single account sheet. And I hope this effect extends to your members in what we've taken to calling "the other 48 States" by picking up the pace of their traffic.

It is my fond belief that we have had only the first taste of the benefits of Alaska and Hawaii statehood, and that your palates and ours will be more and more delighted as we grow in the coming years.

Now, having welcomed you on Alaska's behalf, I want to do a turnabout and join those of you from outside in saluting our hosts—Alaska Airlines, Northern Consolidated Airlines, Reeve Aleutian Airways, and Wien Alaska Airlines.

The labors of our intrepid bush pilots gave birth to these airlines. And their history, for high drama, is unexcelled anywhere.

Some of you may recall that one of these airline founders, Bob Reeve, was my rival in a delegate election a few years ago. If things had turned out a bit differently, your speaker tonight might well be one far better qualified on the subject of Alaska aviation.

But I can speak with a good deal of experience as a passenger. Having been a patron of your four host companies during the travels involved in eight campaigns plus a lifetime of residence in Alaska, I can truly say that I know them well, and I hold them in the highest respect.

Even so, a speaker is bound to gulp a few times when he gets upon his feet to talk about aviation to a group of aviation experts. But a politician is never noted for his lack of temerity and so I prepare to take the plunge. Not earthward, however. We are on a higher level tonight. Even as a layman, I can and will make a brag. In about 35 years of flying, most of it within Alaska and starting in the very early days of aviation, I have never had a forced landing. And I attribute this remarkable record less to my own luck than to the splendid skill of the Alaska aviators who have manned the Alaska skies from then until now.

Happily, one does not have to be a flyer himself to make reference to Alaska's air-mindedness, air traffic, airports, aircraft and aviators.

Will anyone rise to challenge the statement that Alaskans are the most air-minded people in the world? I don't think so—at least not successfully.

Tonight we are dealing almost solely with facts, and very little if at all with fiction. You have no choice in the matter. I am on my feet in firm, if temporary, control and you may escape a barrage of facts only by departing the room. First, I hand to you one which defies analysis, which is simply incredible, which nonetheless has its veracity attested to by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is that certified Alaska air carriers last year carried 409 passengers per thousand population. This was more than 22 times the U.S. average of 18 passengers per thousand. Let this be a goal for the 11 non-Alaska members of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

Alaska is the smallest State in population, making up only twelve one-hundredths of 1 percent of the U.S. total. But in proportion to this population, her air commerce traffic pattern is fantastic.

In 1958, Alaska aircraft departures totaled almost 88,000, equal to 2.8 percent of the U.S. domestic total—or 23 times what the population proportion would lead you to expect. The number of passengers boarded was about 320,600, equal to seventy-four one-hundredths of 1 percent of the domestic total—or six times what you would expect. Tons of cargo totaled more than 10,000, equal to 2.3 percent of the domestic total—or 19 times what you would expect. Tons of airmail was the greatest of all: 7,192 tons, equal to 4.8 percent of the domestic total—or 40 times the population proportion. When we say "send it airmail," as so many of our firms do on their business letterheads, we really mean it.

Of course there are sound reasons for our air-mindedness. We are short of highway and railroad mileage. The operation of ocean and river vessels is seasonal in many areas, while on the other hand our flying weather in many regions is best in winter. In vast parts of Alaska the local service airline or the bush aircraft is the only practical

means of transportation. Then, too, our people have always been eager to be linked as closely as possible with the rest of the United States, which helps explain why we're the flyingest, airmailingest people anywhere.

How about airports? The State division of airports estimates that Alaska has about 600 landing areas of all categories. Gene Roguszka, director of aviation, recently sent me a very handy Alaska airport directory. It lists more than 300 airstrips and seaplane landing areas, and provides maps of most of them.

The 1959 national airport plan issued by the Federal Aviation Agency includes 270 Alaska air commerce airports—4 of them intercontinental, 9 continental, 68 trunk, 111 local, and 78 seaplane facilities. Also included in the plan are 64 general aviation airports.

Aircraft? Alaska's owned total of active registered aircraft was 1,179 as of last January 1. In this measurement we were not, as you might expect, close to such sparsely settled Western States as New Mexico, Wyoming, and the like—but rather to more populous States like Oregon and Louisiana. To put it another way, Alaska has 1 aircraft for every 180 residents, which is unquestionably the highest ratio in the United States.

Of these 1,179 aircraft, 56 were, under the new FAA classification, listed as scheduled and irregular air carriers. However, some of our carriers are in the next 2 categories—among the 64 multiengine planes and 420 postwar 4- and 5-place single engine planes listed under "general aviation." Finally, in the "all other" category, we have 639 more aircraft.

At the same time, we had 2,877 active pilots, or about 1 Alaskan out of every 75. A number of others who once were licensed no longer are on the active list. There has been a lot of talk lately about retiring pilots at the age of 60, or thereabouts. This reminds me that I am now engaged in a research operation aimed at discovering whether A. A. Bennett is still in the land of the living. If he is, you may be sure that he is still flying at an age not exactly known to me but surely such that he would consider a pilot of 60 a mere youngster. From Fairbanks, where he was one of the organizers of the Bennett-Rodebaugh Airplane Co., A. A. Bennett went down to Idaho. He had his commercial license renewed there in 1957 but as yet my research organization has not advanced beyond that point. Bennett was one of the fabulous characters of early-day Alaska aviation. He steadfastly refused to go in for such a modern contrivance as a cabin airplane. Forced finally to give in by the stress of economic competition, Bennett persuaded the Zenith people to build him a special plane with a cabin for the passengers up forward and open cockpit for the flyer way back aft. Bennett was not adverse to telling anyone, most particularly his passengers, the reason for this. He admitted that airplanes fell down once in a while out of the sky and hit the hard, hard earth and he did not propose to be right on top of the engine when and if this occurred. Let the passengers bear the brunt of this while he took charge from the rear, Bennett said.

And he had the clearest blue eyes ever possessed by man. It was this oldtimer's persistent insistence that his eyesight was perfect because when flying he took off his goggles and stuck his head out of the cockpit. He said the gale into which he then faced toned up his optic muscles, and did everything except erase original sin. But I must guard myself for it is easy to start reminiscing about an extraordinary breed of men—the early-day Alaska pilots.

A significant illustration occurred right here in Anchorage last week, revealing that today's men of wings are in tune in every way with those who started Alaska's avia-

tion. This came about when Don Sheldon of Talkeetna was presented with the Special Service Award by General Necresop. This is the highest award given a civilian by the Air Force.

No doubt you have heard Anchorage referred to as the air crossroads of the world. Lest you think our chamber of commerce friends are overstating their case, let me note that in calendar 1958 the FAA towers at International Airport, Merrill Field, and Lake Hood controlled a total of 406,701 aircraft movements. This was only a few thousand less than at the busiest single airport in the Nation—Midway at Chicago.

Our international airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks are in superb locations astride the aerial routes from the Eastern United States to the Far East, and from the Western United States to Europe, over the pole. I think the day is approaching when—if with God's help the peace is kept—other Asia air centers, in China and the Soviet Union, will be reached by flights from Alaska. But even if Peking, Moscow, and Irkutsk do not go up on our destination boards, we can nevertheless look ahead to great growth in our international traffic.

While our intercontinental air traffic is significant today and has great future potential, intra-Alaska traffic is even more striking in relation to national figures. FAA records show that some 66,500 landings were made last year at the 28 intermediate airfields in Alaska. That figure is higher than the total of landings made at the 74 intermediate fields elsewhere in the United States. Air carriers accounted for more than one-third of these landings, which testifies to the vigor of our local service airlines.

These airlines offer plane-window vistas of scenery as awe inspiring as any on the face of the globe. They offer, too, unique recreational tours—to the Arctic, to the Pribilof Islands in the fur seal mating season, to Katmai National Monument for unmatched trout fishing, and to the national park at America's highest peak, Mount McKinley.

Congress and the Federal Government have for years recognized the importance of aviation to Alaska. But our Territorial status and our lack of voting representation have tended to hold back full development of our airports and related facilities.

In 1948 Congress authorized Federal construction and operation of completely new international airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks. The initial appropriation of \$13 million was raised to \$17 million 2 years later.

Anchorage International Airport received the lion's share of the money and was somewhat more adequately planned and built than Fairbanks International. Today both these airports urgently need runway extensions to meet the demands of the jet age.

The coming of statehood altered our airport situation and presented problems to which the Alaska delegation in Congress and the State government have devoted major attention.

In recommending provisions for the Alaska omnibus bill this year, the Eisenhower administration proposed to get Uncle Sam out of the international airport business in Alaska by giving the Anchorage and Fairbanks Airports to the State without charge.

The omnibus bill—now enacted into law—also provided transitional grants of \$28½ million during the 5 fiscal years, beginning with the current one. Of these transitional grants, it was understood \$4½ million should be applied to capital improvements at the international airports.

However, the extensions at Anchorage and Fairbanks were estimated at a cost of some \$9,800,000. So it became obvious that Alaska would have to get more than the flat sum of \$1,350,000 a year it received in recent years under the Federal airports program if the improvements were to be made.

Under the old Airport Act, Alaska was of course treated as a Territory. It did not share funds on the basis of a land area and population formula, as the other States did. Nor was Alaska eligible to receive any of the \$15-million-a-year discretionary fund which could be allocated by the program administrator to the most important projects, wherever they might be. But the Territory did have one advantage in the old law. It was required to match funds on a 3-Federal dollars-to-1-Territorial-dollar basis, instead of the split of about 2 Federal dollars to 1 State dollar for public lands States.

Early in this session, the Senate passed a new airport bill. It would have boosted the available funds considerably, but would have continued to treat Alaska—and Hawaii—on a basis similar to that in the old law as far as matching and eligibility were concerned.

The House of Representatives, however, took a quite different approach to the airport bill. The House cut back the proposed expenditures in relation to the Senate version, but on the other hand it proposed to treat Alaska on the same basis as other States.

The House, while it was more modest than the Senate, still favored a higher level program than the old one. But the administration wanted to phase out the entire airport program gradually. So the battle of the budget soon was raging around the airport issue.

Senate and House conferees could not agree on either one of the bills passed, nor on a compromise somewhere in between. As their discussions wore on, tempers grew more and more brittle. The upshot was that, under the pressure of a June 30 deadline, the conferees finally recommended a simple 2-year extension of the old \$63-million-dollar-a-year program. Both Houses reluctantly accepted this recommendation.

This meant Alaska would get only \$1,350,000 and still would be treated as a Territory. When this decision was reached in conference it was simply impossible thereafter to make any changes referring to Alaska especially, or to make any changes at all in any part of the program.

The inadequate treatment of Alaska was so flagrant that the President called for its correction when he signed the Airport Act extension.

Next, the Alaska delegation introduced an amending bill. It would have boosted our State's share of the airport funds by adding money to be distributed under the overall formula and by making Alaska eligible to share on the same basis as other States. However, as more pencils were brought into use to do the necessary calculations, it became apparent that around \$11 million in additional funds would have to be authorized by amendatory legislation if Alaska were to receive that which it would be entitled to as a State without any of the other States suffering cutbacks, which they were not at all willing to accept. We were told very frankly that an effort to add any such sum would, if successful, confront a Presidential veto.

Obviously, there was no point then in engaging in legislative exercises in the Congress for the fun of it. And, very factually, I must add that I think that neither the House nor the Senate would have accepted a bill adding to the total airport sum by about \$11 million. When the conferees decided, and the two Houses accepted the proposal for a simple extension of the existing act there was no likelihood that any substantial amendment would thereafter be accepted.

What to do, then? The members of the Alaska congressional delegation considered this as a proposition of the greatest urgency and importance. We held meetings with the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the

Budget and a group of his people. It was then that the hopelessness of expecting a worthwhile amendment to the Airport Act became apparent. If I may give myself a measure of credit it was about that time that I came to the conclusion that the most we could hope for—and the very vital most it could turn out to be—would be to amend the law so as to permit Alaska to share in the discretionary funds allotted to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Following the meeting with the Bureau of the Budget the members of the Alaska congressional delegation had another meeting with Deputy FAA Administrator James T. Pyle, and members of his staff. Whether it was by coincidence or whether in the circumstances it was the only decision that could be made, they and I about simultaneously at this meeting put the stamp of endorsement on a sharing in the discretionary fund.

The Administrator's views were not long after communicated to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when Jim Pyle said in part:

"If the amendment which I recommended is adopted, Alaska will receive money to meet its urgent needs out of the discretionary fund. The Administrator will be in a position to insure that such money is used to meet these needs, and he will also require that Alaska be treated like other States in matching the Federal funds advanced. Alaska will also retain the advantage of having its share of project costs financed out of the \$1,350,000 already authorized remain at 25 percent."

Mr. Pyle's statement about matching any discretionary funds granted means Alaska must put up 37½ percent to Uncle Sam's 67½ percent. But on the basic allocation Alaska will continue to match one-quarter to the Federal Government's three-quarters.

The amendment recommended by the FAA was accepted by the Senate committee which unanimously reported the bill. The bill was then passed by the Senate last week. I have talked with Chairman HARRIS of the corresponding House committee and urged prompt action on the bill there. I am hopeful that it will be granted, and that affirmative action will be taken.

Does this mean that substantial grants will be made from the discretionary fund to Alaska in the next 2 years? Not at all. It means that Alaska will have a chance, together with every other State, to request such funds. But I am confident that the high urgency of the need for runway extensions here at Anchorage and at Fairbanks, plus other airport needs in Alaska, are recognized by the FAA and will receive appropriate consideration from that agency of the Federal Government. In this connection, I cannot speak too highly of the splendid cooperation which has and is being given to us in the Federal Aviation Agency from General Quesada and Jim Pyle on down. Uniformly, they have been understanding, helpful and possessed of a vigor and will to advance the cause of Alaska aviation.

Taking a look back, you may be interested to know that from the 1947 fiscal year through fiscal year 1959, \$7,284,904 had been made available as Federal allocations to Alaska. With this money 38 projects have been physically and financially completed, 12 are physically completed but awaiting financial payment from the Federal Government, 19 are now under construction and should be completed before October this year and 13 are programed for construction.

But even if the discretionary fund amendment becomes law, we shall be operating under a jerry-built stopgap arrangement. The airport program which was extended to mid-1961 is by no means a wholly adequate program to meet the Nation's jet age needs. It is a program that was veto proofed to meet most of the President's objections

and to assure the country that the airport program would not expire completely. I think that you will all recall that the President vetoed a new airport program in 1958.

I look forward to passage of a much better and more comprehensive program under the new administration that will take office in 1961. One point of that program must be treatment of Alaska and Hawaii on an equal footing with the other 48 States.

Senator GRUENING, Representative RIVERS, and I were pleased to have been able to help our State government work out arrangements for the change of hands of the two international airports. This change should be completed in the next year. In the meantime, the FAA will operate the airports as the agent of the State.

In addition, the smaller intermediate airports held by the FAA are to be transferred to the State gradually.

When these transitions are completed, the State of Alaska will be operating one of the most extensive and busiest airport systems in the country. It will still need plenty of improvement in the future. We in Congress will do our best to see that it is as adequately supported by Federal grants as any other State's.

When two-motored aircraft first came into use in Alaska, Alaska pilots first went into uniform. I can remember ever so vividly those great big, marvelous Lockheed Electras, which must have carried 12 or 14 passengers and which opened up an entirely new era in Alaska aviation. The pilots denounced the uniforms they were required to wear with an understanding and ability to use the language comparable to that of a cowpuncher trying to lasso a balky steer. But I always thought that secretly they were proud and pleased as could be. Those were the days when on landing the passengers were told to remain in their seats until the pilot and copilot had made leisurely and grand exit from the plane.

Today it is otherwise. But the aura of romance, of accomplishment, of derring-do, of pioneering, of adventuring in the far places, still surrounds the Alaska aviator. They are successors to those elder giants of the Yukon of the gold stampede days. Romance, mystery, physical daring and hardihood—all of these are elements that go into the makeup of the true pioneer, wherever he is found at whatever time in history. For example, I cannot think of Ray Peterson as the president of a successful airline which is a constituent member of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, so much as a helmet-and-goggle flyer in the perfect days of long ago.

So I would conclude here by saluting a brave race of men who have carved their place in Alaska history and whose exploits and vision have opened up for us—for all Americans—the vastness of the Alaska skies and the treasures of land and ocean that lie beneath.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is my 11th annual report to my constituents; I have sent them an annual report every year since coming to Congress. This report will be a résumé of my aims and efforts in behalf of the people I represent, as well as a summing

up of the work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. I have enjoyed representing the fine people of my district, and have considered it a privilege to strive for legislation beneficial to them as well as for the best interests of our country.

This Congress has accomplished a great amount of work, when we consider the overwhelming volume of business before it, the defense of our Nation being of primary concern. Vital domestic issues had to be considered as well as the Mutual Security Act, which fortifies our position with friendly nations and enables them to gain economic strength and protect themselves against aggressors.

In addition, we have had to grapple with the many crises engendered by the Soviet menace and the continuing cold war, as well as the explosive situations prevalent in many corners of the earth. Israel's position remains untenable and insecure regardless of the tremendous sacrifices of her people, their ability and industry, for her enemies still threaten to destroy her. I have lost no opportunity to urge that she be given all possible aid, for Israel is our bastion of democracy in the Middle East; she is our friend and ally; she deserves all that we can do to help her.

LABOR

This country's millions of workers await with great anxiety the final provisions of the highly controversial labor bill. At this writing, we do not know what the law will provide, as the Senate and House bills are in conference. We do know that as usual, Republicans favored management, and they, together with the southern bloc, succeeded in passing the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House. This has been labeled a bill which would "kill" the union movement; it has been charged that it was "probably authored by representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers." It has also been charged that a deal was made between Republicans and certain southern Democrats—that the Republicans would stymie action on civil-rights legislation in return for southern votes in favor of the Republican-sponsored Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted against this bill, the effect of which would throw the weight of the Federal Government on the side of management and would inflict punishment on the millions of honest, law-abiding men and women who belong to unions.

I favored a strong and constructive labor reform bill, which would protect union members and end abuses; I shall continue to fight against any labor bill which is punitive, which penalizes innocent workers, and which would deprive labor of any of its hard-won battles and advances. I hope that we shall have the opportunity to consider a final bill which will provide union members with all necessary safeguards and which will not tip the Taft-Hartley scales still more in favor of employers and against workers.

For many years, I have introduced bills to increase the minimum hourly wage from \$1 to \$1.25. I urged action on my bill, pointing out that millions

of our people are merely existing; they live in substandard conditions because they are underpaid and because high living costs and high taxes make it impossible to provide their families and themselves with bare necessities.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Hope for passage of an effective civil rights bill at the present session of Congress grows dimmer; this is a severe blow to all who recognize the great need for such legislation. The 1957 civil rights right-to-vote bill is virtually ineffective; it needs teeth. Unless the Civil Rights Commission is given some real power, Negroes will go into the 1960 elections as voteless as ever. The President wants the Commission extended for 2 more years. This amounts to only a token gesture on his part, when we consider that he has yet to make an earnest plea for strong civil rights legislation. The Republicans are responsible for failure to vote a civil rights bill out of committee; if the Republicans were sincere in their campaign promises regarding civil rights, Members of Congress would have had the opportunity to vote on a good bill long before this, but so far, the Republican members of the committee in charge have withheld their support. The Attorney General must have authority to seek Federal court injunctions to enforce school desegregation and civil rights generally, and legislation to give him such authority should be given priority.

I have introduced strong civil rights bills to end the unconscionable discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and other human indecencies which are being inflicted upon a vast segment of our population. We cannot claim to have true democracy in our country, equality of men, equality of opportunity, freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution, until every vestige of discrimination because of race, color, or religion is abolished.

HOUSING

The President's veto of the first housing bill passed during the present session of Congress came as a great shock to me. In my opinion, his action was not only ill advised but was unconscionable, when we consider that countless Americans now merely exist in substandard dwellings, and that they must rely on the help of the Federal Government for public housing.

We have now passed a second housing bill and it is to be hoped that it will become law. The bill provides for urban renewal grants; 37,000 additional public housing units, loan programs for construction of college classrooms and dormitories, and housing for elderly persons. This represents a constructive and vitally needed program, but it only begins to meet the minimum standards we should set for American living.

IMMIGRATION

I, with other members of the New York Democratic delegation, introduced an Immigration and Citizenship Act to supersede the present Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the McCarran-Walter Act. It has long been recognized that the present law is discrimina-

tory, unfair, and undemocratic. Under our proposal there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, no classification of U.S. citizens into two categories, native born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens. Many other necessary provisions are also included.

I hoped that, in view of the fact that the United States joined with other free countries in the United Nations in sponsoring a proposal for a World Refugee Year, and inasmuch as our attention was directed toward those unfortunates so desperately in need of a homeland, Congress would pass legislation liberalizing our immigration laws. However, that hope has been dashed also, and we continue to shirk our duty toward mankind while other nations, less able to sacrifice than ours, are opening their hearts and doors to the unfortunate, the homeless, the innocent victims of wars and oppression.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Democrats are rightfully proud of their sincere efforts and great accomplishments. Their aim has always been to afford the help which the people need. By contrast, we find the Republicans still indulging in their deceitful promises and then sabotaging or ignoring the legislation which would provide for the very benefits they advocate by word only. As witness the deplorable plight of our public school system. The administration has, as usual, called attention to the desperate conditions, but has made no effectual moves to correct those conditions. There is a shortage now of about 140,000 classrooms throughout the United States. There is a great shortage of teachers. The administration is primarily to blame that this grave problem has once again been swept under the rug and that about 10 million American children are doomed to overcrowded and obsolescent classrooms in the richest Nation on earth.

SOCIAL SECURITY, PROBLEMS OF THE AGED, AND OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

I have been happy to support legislation liberalizing benefits under the Social Security Act and have introduced bills to provide further benefits. Among the latter are bills to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the act; to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits.

I also introduced a bill to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. The protection offered by this bill is vitally needed by those many thousands of our older people who now cannot afford necessary medical, nursing, or hospital care; they cannot obtain or afford private insurance and they cannot meet the expense

of illness. Costs of such care continue to rise, and the Federal Government must act to protect all those who are in dire need of such assistance.

Older workers and their problems have continued to receive my attention, and I reintroduced my resolution which would end existing bias against the hiring of older workers, and which would assist them in maintaining their rightful and dignified place as useful members of society.

I have introduced bills to lighten the taxload; to repeal excise taxes; to grant additional income tax exemptions to those supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to those receiving retirement annuities or pensions; to those who are physically handicapped; to increase the personal income tax exemption of taxpayers.

Veterans deserve all possible assistance, and I have been happy to support legislation in their behalf at every opportunity, as well as to introduce bills

beneficial to them. I am gratified that the liberalized veterans' pension bill, recently passed, has been signed into law.

I voted for the Federal employee health program bill and am pleased that it passed. I trust it will be signed into law. This will enable Federal employees to purchase protection at a cost which is within their means, from the unanticipated and oppressive costs of medical care, as well as the often crushing expense of so-called catastrophic illness or serious injury. The bill is designed to close the gap which now exists and bring the Government abreast of most private employers who have for many years been establishing and operating contributory health benefit programs for their employees.

I was happy to procure passage of my bill in the House to provide for the honorary designation of Saint Ann's churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site. This culminated 11 years of unrelenting work on

my part regarding the designation of Saint Ann's churchyard. Last year, I thought my work was finished when the House passed the bill, but it was defeated in the Senate committee. I renewed my efforts again this year; it again passed the House, and at this moment the bill is once more bottled up in the Senate committee. I can only hope that the Senate will take favorable action.

CONCLUSION

Space limitation prevents my discussing all the subjects important to my constituents. I hope the foregoing will show, to some extent, what I have endeavored to accomplish and what the 86th Congress has done so far.

My congressional office at 938 Simpson Street is open daily, and my constituents are welcome to call there and discuss matters of interest to them. I am always pleased to see them, to receive their letters, and to do all I can to be helpful.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1959

(Legislative day of Monday, August 31, 1959)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, whose love is unfailing and in whose mercy there's a wideness like the wideness of the sea.

At this wayside shrine of prayer set up so long ago by those who launched our ship of state and hallowed across the long years we lift up our souls unto Thee.

We come unto our father's God

Their rock is our salvation

The eternal arms their dear abode

We make our habitation

We seek Thee as Thy saints have sought
In every generation.

In this forum of deliberation and debate amid the din and clash of differing opinions may we here unite in keeping always a constant sense of the eternal which will save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 2, 1959, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON SENATE BILL 1555, SUBMITTED DURING RECESS (S. DOC. NO. 51)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 2, 1959,

Mr. KENNEDY, on September 2, 1959, submitted the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, which was printed.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, September 3, 1959, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 539. An act for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Lee Freeman;

S. 669. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to the Bethel Baptist Church of Henderson, Tenn.;

S. 696. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annie Voisin Whitley;

S. 1071. An act for the relief of Nettie Korn and Manfred Korn;

S. 1298. An act for the relief of Concetta Meglio Meglio;

S. 1392. An act for the relief of Isabel M. Menz;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Allen Howard Pilgrim, Cheryl Ann Pilgrim, Robb Alexander Pilgrim, and Jocelyn Marie Pilgrim;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Edmund A. Hannay;

S. 1667. An act for the relief of the widow of Col. Claud C. Smith;

S. 1792. An act for the relief of Lilia Alvarez Szabo;

S. 1915. An act for the relief of Chung Ching Wei;

S. 1921. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 1958. An act to amend section 12 of the act of March 5, 1915, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect of wages of U.S. seamen;

S. 2021. An act for the relief of Irene Millos;

S. 2027. An act for the relief of William James Harkins and Thomas Lloyd Harkins;

S. 2050. An act for the relief of Leokadia Jomboski;

S. 2081. An act for the relief of Yadviga Boczar;

S. 2102. An act for the relief of Irene Wladyslaw Burda; and

S. 2238. An act for the relief of Kenzo Hachtmann, a minor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 1, 1959, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 510. An act for the relief of Peter R. Muller;

S. 554. An act for the relief of Argyrios G. Georgandopoulos;

S. 900. An act to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes;

S. 967. An act for the relief of Lea Levi; and

S. 1945. An act for the relief of Josef Jan Loukotka, Mieczyslaw J. Plorkowski, and Jan Frantisek Sevcik.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLARK, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee